


School of Theology at Claremont



1001 1336810



HARVARD THEOLOGICAL STUDIES
VII

IS MARK A ROMAN
GOSPEL?

BY

BENJAMIN W. BACON

BUCKINGHAM PROFESSOR OF NEW TESTAMENT CRITICISM
AND INTERPRETATION IN YALE UNIVERSITY



CAMBRIDGE
HARVARD UNIVERSITY PRESS
LONDON: HUMPHREY MILFORD
OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS
1919

BS
2585
B26



Theology Library

SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY
AT CLAREMONT
California

HARVARD THEOLOGICAL STUDIES

HARVARD THEOLOGICAL STUDIES

EDITED FOR THE
FACULTY OF DIVINITY
IN
HARVARD UNIVERSITY

BY
GEORGE F. MOORE, JAMES H. ROPES,
KIRSOPP LAKE



CAMBRIDGE
HARVARD UNIVERSITY PRESS
LONDON: HUMPHREY MILFORD
OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS
1919

BS
2585
B26

HARVARD THEOLOGICAL STUDIES
VII

IS MARK A ROMAN
GOSPEL?/

BY

BENJAMIN W. BACON

BUCKINGHAM PROFESSOR OF NEW TESTAMENT CRITICISM
AND INTERPRETATION IN YALE UNIVERSITY



CAMBRIDGE
HARVARD UNIVERSITY PRESS
LONDON: HUMPHREY MILFORD
OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS
1919

Theology Library
SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY
AT CLAREMONT
California

TO
HARVARD UNIVERSITY
IN GRATEFUL ACKNOWLEDGMENT OF THE
DEGREE OF S.T.D. CONFERRED
JUNE 18, 1914

COPYRIGHT, 1919
HARVARD UNIVERSITY PRESS

CONTENTS

	PAGE
INTRODUCTION	1
I. THE TRADITION	7
II. THE DISSEMINATION	34
III. THE INTERNAL EVIDENCE	
A. LANGUAGE	48
B. EDITORIAL GLOSSES AND EXPLANATIONS	55
C. LOCAL GEOGRAPHY AND HISTORY	59
D. THE "PAULINISM" OF MARK	66
E. ATTITUDE TOWARD JEWISH-CHRISTIAN LEADERS	75
F. MARKAN VERSUS PAULINE DOCTRINE OF THE HARDEN- ING OF ISRAEL	80
G. MARKAN CHRISTOLOGY	85
H. ROMAN RITUAL AS AFFECTING MARK	90
IV. CONCLUSION	99

IS MARK A ROMAN GOSPEL?

NEXT to the authorship and the date of a Gospel the question of its provenance is of vital moment to the historico-critical interpreter.

An example of this is the fourth Gospel, a writing attributed since 181 A.D. to the Apostle John. It dates from about 110 A.D. and almost certainly emanates from Ephesus, but differs from the Synoptic Gospels to a degree impossible to explain as a mere matter of development in time. Within the limits of a decade or two a Christian community does not so revolutionize its fundamental religious conceptions as to substitute a Christology of incarnation, such as we find in the Johannine writings, for a Christology of apotheosis, such as monopolizes the entire field in all the Synoptic literature, and manifestly represents the accepted doctrine throughout the churches which employed this literature for catechetical purposes. And the contrast between Johannine and Synoptic literature is not confined to Christology. The differences are quite as great in other doctrinal fields such as soteriology and eschatology, to say nothing of questions of form and of historical fact.

The true explanation of these differences between the first three and the fourth Gospel must be more geographical than temporal. The two types derive not so much from different periods as from different environments. We may properly speak of the four Synoptic writings (counting Acts as a separate work) as Syrian; for in spite of the admixture in Matthew and Luke of an important Second Source,¹ the three Gospels all represent, through common dependence on an outline of "Petrine" ² story, a basic report which, however adapted in Mark to the emancipating, anti-legalistic, principles of the

¹ The material commonly designated by the symbol Q.

² The term "Petrine" is here employed, not in the doctrinal sense attached to it by the Tübingen critics, but merely to characterize material which has Peter as its central figure next to the Lord; or at least reports events as they would appear from the testimony of this Apostle.

Gentile churches (and in this doctrinal sense Pauline), goes back for its historical data to Peter and the Galilean Apostles.

In the later, elaborated form of Matthew and Luke this Synoptic type of evangelic tradition cannot be much earlier than 100 A.D., whether Matthew or (more probably) Luke be prior. The Markan form is more primitive; but while it may antedate Matthew and Luke by ten or possibly fifteen years, ancient tradition itself does not at first claim for Mark an origin within the life-time of the Apostles, but frankly admits the loss of the true sequence of events in Jesus' career, ascribing it to the inability of Mark to consult the eye-witnesses.¹ This unfortunate disappearance of the "order" is attested not merely by the ancient tradition which we have presently to scrutinize, but at an earlier time by our third evangelist (Luke 1, 1-4, *καθ' ἑξῆς*), and subsequently by an early defender of the "order" of the fourth Gospel.²

Whatever the precise dates, and whatever the exact provenance of this triad of Gospels, Mark, its earliest member, together with the two satellites of Mark, embodies what we may designate the "Petrine," or "Galilean," tradition of the sayings and doings of Jesus. The Ephesian Gospel, which stands over against this group, in closer relation to the Second Source than to Mark, may justly be termed "Deutero-Pauline"; for it not only embodies the distinctive Christology and soteriology of Paul, in many respects completing and reconstructing Synoptic tradition from the viewpoint characteristic of the Pauline Epistles, especially Ephesians, but (as we have seen) it can be definitely traced to Ephesus, the headquarters of Paul's missionary activity. This Ephesian Gospel, if it deigns to borrow some few elements of Galilean tradition, presents them only in a form completely recast, adapting them to the paramount purpose of exhibiting the whole earthly career of Jesus from the Pauline standpoint. It is set forth as a sort of *avatar* of the eternal Logos.

¹ On the later modifications of the tradition which avoid this unwelcome result, see below, p. 20.

² The Muratorian Fragment (to be dated with Lightfoot ca. 185, against Zahn, Harnack and modern scholars generally). Its author quotes 1 John 1, 1-3 in support of his claim that John narrated events "in their order."

A concrete example will help to demonstrate the importance (as yet by no means appreciated) of this differentiation of Petrine, or Synoptic, gospel tradition from the Deutero-Pauline, or Johannine; for it has a direct bearing on questions of historical criticism. The Petrine tradition in both its branches has much to say of Jesus' work in exorcizing evil spirits. In the Second Source one of the principal dialogues centers round the accusation of the scribes, "He casteth out by Beelzebub." In both elements of the Book of Acts exorcism is prominent as a demonstration of the Spirit and of power. In the Petrine speeches of I Acts¹ Jesus' ministry is specifically described as "going about doing good, healing all those that were oppressed of the devil." In Mark, above all, exorcism is the typical evidence of Jesus' supernatural power. It is the "beginning of miracles" at Capernaum (1, 21-28), the commission of the Twelve (3, 15), and the proof of supreme power at the mount of Transfiguration (9, 14-29). Power over demons is the assurance the reader receives from the evangelist that Jesus is in reality "the Holy One of God" (1, 24, 34; 3, 11-12; 5, 7), and constitutes the ground on which the Twelve are brought to this conviction (4, 39-41).² Its supreme manifestation is the beginning of the end (13, 25). Most characteristic is the story of the exorcizing of the legion of devils (5, 1-20). Here Red.-Marc.,³ if he does not actually build upon the well attested incident of II Acts (cf. Mark 5, 7 with Acts 16, 17), at all events makes manifest the ground of his own theory of demonic recognition (1, 24, 34; 3, 10-12). On this Petrine basis accordingly exorcism appears as the typical and characteristic mighty work of Jesus and his disciples. It is the nucleus and core of Markan Christology.

Turn now to Pauline and Deutero-Pauline tradition. Only in the form of a wrestling against the powers of darkness "in

¹ Acts 1, 1-15, 35 has been proved by Prof. C. C. Torrey (Composition and Date of Acts. Harvard Theological Studies I, 1916) to be the translation of an Aramaic work which has Peter as its central figure. Following Torrey's nomenclature we designate this portion as I Acts.

² It is important to observe that the language addressed to the storm (περίλωστο, cf. 1, 25) implies that to the evangelist it is a manifestation of *demonic* power.

³ I. e., Redactor Marci. The designation is used for the evangelist individually in distinction from his sources, or material.

the heavenlies" (*ἐν τοῖς ἐπουρανίοις*) is there any trace of exorcism in Paul; and this is the only trace of it in the fourth Gospel (John 12, 31). It is easy to attribute the silence of Paul as to exorcisms of Jesus to accident, somewhat less easy thus to account for his silence on the subject in referring to gifts of "miracles" and "healings" in the Church, and practically impossible thus to account for the silence of the fourth Gospel. We may say that Pauline and Deutero-Pauline tradition is on this point less historical. There is abundant reason to hold that on this point the more cultured circles represented by Paul and the fourth evangelist felt rather differently from the *οἱ πολλοί*, and their reserve may be thus accounted for. On the other hand the type of Christology represented in Mark 5, 1-20 and the connected passages need not be unaffected by the form of belief cherished in Petrine circles.

The purpose for which this illustration is adduced is not to determine on which side the truer representation lies, but to note the difference, and the consequent importance of distinguishing the two types of evangelic tradition, and to observe that they are not developments the one from the other, but must have existed for a considerable period side by side.

At the latest the Johannine Gospel cannot be more than a decade or two later in origin than the Synoptic group, whose development covers approximately the period 75-100 A.D. Provenance, therefore, in the case of this fundamental distinction between the Petrine and the Deutero-Pauline type, is a matter of much more significance to the critical exegete than mere date. The contrast of Johannine and Synoptic represents the difference between the Deutero-Pauline point of view and that of the Galilean Apostles in its later development. It is a difference which with due appreciation of the provenance becomes not merely intelligible but illuminating. In their attempt to explain the historical origin of the Gospels the Tübingen critics made altogether too much of the idea of rectilinear development. Recognizing the extreme degree of the difference here noted, they postulated almost a century of time to account for the development of the Johannine Logos doctrine beyond the apotheosis Christology of the Synoptists; forgetting that in

all but name the Logos doctrine is already present in the Pauline Epistles, the earliest literature of all, since, group for group, the Pauline Epistles antedate the Synoptic writings by a full generation. Thus the school of Baur, in spite of their epoch-making insight into the interworking of Jewish and Gentile tendencies in the apostolic church (the so-called Petrine and Pauline gospel), conspicuously failed in their theory of Gospel origins. The failure was largely due to neglect of the geographical factor. It remains to be seen whether twentieth-century criticism will have broader vision than Tübingen, and better appreciation of the fact so curiously symbolized by Irenaeus in his famous defense¹ of the "sacred quaternion," that the great catholic Gospels are representative of *world-regions*, standing for phases of the common teaching characteristic of the great historic divisions of the Church.

Mark, the earliest extant Gospel, shows the beginnings of Synoptic development, or of Gospel *story* as distinct from *precept*. It determines the Syrian type, and in this case, for this reason, date is a matter of greater importance than provenance. Fortunately the post-apostolic² date for Mark, so emphatically attested in the most ancient testimony (and in our judgment strongly corroborated by the internal evidence), is only disputed by a group of ultra-modern scholars following the watchword of Harnack, "Back to tradition." In this case the reaction is not merely back to tradition but far beyond it.

In the case of the type-determining, original member of the Synoptic group the question of provenance may perhaps be admitted to be on the whole less important than that of date; but it is far from being merely academic.

A Gospel is seldom the product of a single author's mind, and for this reason is not in the earlier times superscribed with his name. Each of the four canonical Gospels, at least, embodies

¹ Haer. iii, 11, 8.

² In an important passage of his *Stromateis* (vii, 17, 106 f.). Clement of Alexandria dates the periods covered respectively by the teaching (1) of the Lord, (2) of the Apostles, (3) of the heresiarchs. The Apostolic age ends according to Clement with the close of "Paul's ministry under Nero." It is in this sense that we employ the term "post-apostolic."

the catechetic material of a church, the entire available record of its many pastors and teachers relating to the mission and teaching of Jesus. Compositions of a more limited character, reflecting the special views of individuals, undoubtedly were produced. References to them occur in the Fathers. But such writings could not survive. Only what stood for the generality, and was in the main a just reflection of current belief obtained general currency, and ultimately canonicity. Hence the importance of provenance. Were it merely a question where the evangelist Mark happened to be when he sat down to write, it would be trifling enough. If, however, this Gospel really represents that phase of Syrian evangelic tradition which had become current in the great Gentile church of Rome a decade or so after the death of Paul, the fact is of vital significance. It will throw much-needed light on the history of this obscure period, and will help us to interpret its scanty records. In confronting the problem we necessarily fall back upon the approved critical method: first, scrutiny of early testimony; secondly, survey of the phenomena of dissemination; thirdly, comparison of the internal evidence.

I. THE TRADITION

THE very form of the question "Is Mark Roman?" implies the existence of a tradition that it emanates from Rome. This tradition can, in fact, be traced back to ca. 150 A.D., and was so generally accepted throughout the second half of the second century that we cannot but give it consideration; all the more because it persists in spite of a strong tendency, illustrated in the Muratorianum and elsewhere,¹ to carry back the origin of the Gospels to a period antecedent to the dispersion of the Twelve from Palestine. Nor is the tradition of Roman provenance for Mark wholly invalidated, as I hope to show, by the fact that it cannot be traced further back than Papias (fl. 140-160). Why Papias held this belief is precisely the present subject of enquiry.

Tradition, in general, is like the British historian of science whose "foible was omniscience." It must "know all mysteries and all knowledge," and while it cannot be said to "endure all things" it certainly "believeth all things, hopeth all things," and "never faileth." Like the dragoman who escorts the devout traveller through the Holy Land, its business is to please. Hence, if at a loss for true information, it never fails to apply the spur to a practised and willing, though generally imitative imagination. The framer of tradition and the exhibitor of sacred sites (often one and the same individual) will always relate what he believes his enquirer wishes to hear, in as close approximation as his guessing powers can determine the preference. Historians are therefore quite accustomed, since the days of Herodotus, to scrutinize the answers tradition offers to their enquiries, making allowance for this courteous volubility. We also allow for its very natural (and usually quite transparent) bias in favor of the currently accepted view. But we ought

¹ The clause of the Muratorianum which represents the Apostle John as consulting with his fellow disciples preparatory to writing his Gospel, taken together with the curious reference to Paul as "following the example of his predecessor John in writing to seven churches only," shows that this contemporary of Irenaeus thinks of the fourth Gospel as written in Palestine. Irenaeus and others explicitly declare this of Matthew.

also to realize (and this is often overlooked) how much difference it makes to the reliability of the witness of tradition what kind of information is solicited.

Tradition is equally voluble, and equally positive, when stating fact or fiction. But there are some things which in the nature of the case are traditionally knowable, concerning which it may, therefore, be profitably consulted; and other things which in the nature of the case are not matters of public information, concerning which, therefore, enquiry elicits only the confusion of words without knowledge.

When questions are raised concerning the authorship, date, or provenance of any undated, anonymous composition such as a Gospel, the relative values of tradition and internal evidence differ very greatly. As regards date, tradition, for obvious reasons, is usually vague and hesitating.¹ Tradition, as a rule, has as little motive as means for determining such matters. Criticism will therefore usually find a better basis for the date of a given writing in the internal evidence than in the statements of the Fathers. As respects the author's name, on the other hand, the situation is reversed. Criticism can rarely venture even the most tentative affirmation. Tradition has the field to itself, and is bold in proportion to its consciousness of the general ignorance. It names the author of any ancient, anonymous document with perfect confidence, looking only to meet the wishes of its patrons and to enhance the value of the work on which both parties depend. Thus, when tradition roundly affirms that Moses wrote the Pentateuch and David the Psalms, the public applauds, while the critic is put to the blush. What avails it to disprove his opponent's positive affirmation, when he stands dumb before the counterdemand, "Well, if Moses and David did not write these books, who did?"

¹ The great exception to this general rule is the date "the end of the reign of Domitian" for the appearance of Revelation, a date known to Irenaeus (probably through Papias) and independently confirmed by Epiphanius. In this much disputed book of "prophecy," the predictive element made the question of date vital to the controversy and so preserved it. Criticism is turning back in our day to accept it as correct for Revelation in its present form. Its rejection by the Tübingen critics in favor of a date, earlier by a quarter of a century, put forward on purely internal grounds is curiously like the present attempt to outstrip antiquity in carrying back the date of Mark.

To the general public such ignorance is unpardonable. The more experienced recognize contrariwise in the assumed knowledge of the traditionalist what Polycarp in his Epistle calls "the empty talk of the many (*ματαιότης τῶν πολλῶν*) and his younger fellow bishop Papias, our earliest enquirer into the mystery of Gospel origins, calls the information of "those who have so very much to tell (*οἱ τὰ πολλὰ λέγοντες*). By the contrast he draws between these and "those who teach the truth," Papias implies that the information of these popular teachers, eagerly sought by "the many," was of the abundant kind that can be affirmed but not verified.¹

As regards the provenance of a writing, tradition will be apt to speak with less apologetic bias, and with far greater likelihood of knowing whereof it affirms than as regards authorship. Take as example the Book of Revelation. Doctrinal controversy brought the book into the full glare of publicity within a half-century of its origin.² Between 145 and 190 it was vehemently denounced by opponents of the "Phrygian" heresy (Montanism), and as emphatically commended by chiliasts such as Papias and those who (as Eusebius avers) were influenced by Papias in the direction of his own chiliasm, Justin Martyr, and Irenaeus, perhaps also Melito of Sardis, who wrote a defence of the book. In this case what could really be known is apparent, and should be distinguished by critics from what could not be known, but would inevitably tend to be asserted by artless inference. For the one kind of statement we have a perfect right to depend on the assertions of the Fathers; for the other we have not. When Papias and others of his age and school affirm the "authenticity," literally the "trustworthiness" (*τὸ ἀξιόπιστον*), of Revelation, as they are reported to do by Andreas of Caesarea, what they really mean (if we regard Andreas' report as exact), and what Justin means when he declares that the vision of the millennial New Jerusalem was seen

¹ With the two classes of false teaching denounced by Polycarp and Papias compare the two of similar character in 1 Tim. 6, 3-5 and 20-21.

² I.e., in the Greek form in which we know it, prefaced by the letters to the seven churches of Asia. The Greek work is based upon an older, Palestinian apocalypse (or apocalypses) translated from Aramaic, or Hebrew. The original may date back in whole or in part before the death of Nero.

“ by John an Apostle of the Lord,” is that their antichilastic opponents, who at this time were repudiating and disparaging Revelation as a spurious and heretical book, were wrong; because to their certain knowledge it had been promulgated and employed with acceptance and honor by orthodox churches in the region of Ephesus since “ the end of the reign of Domitian.” When such early defenders of the chief inspired book of millenarianism go beyond this knowable fact, and are subpoenaed (with or without their consent) to vouch for the identity of the speaker throughout the composition in its present form, they manifestly transcend their sphere. In the epilogue of Revelation (22, 8–9) the editor of the book affirms (doubtless in good faith) that the seer who in 19, 10 had used exactly this same representation and phraseology was no other than the Apostle John (!). He reiterates this assertion in the preamble (Rev. 1, 1–3) and again in the introduction (1, 4, 9). He even takes the liberty of continuing the utterance in the first person. It is the business of the critic, after comparing 19, 10 with 22, 8–9, to decide whether this affirmation is correct or not; whether it represents knowledge or conjecture. Papias and the later defenders of the book, if they really went so far as Andreas alleges in vouching for it, and in any case Justin, who is probably echoing Papias, make an assertion which oversteps their knowledge as clearly as their intent; for few things are more certain than that the same individual who as seer in Rev. 19, 10 had just been forbidden to worship the angel and desisted, did not attempt it again as editor in 22, 8.

The example of Revelation illustrates our distinction. The place where, and (more vaguely) the time when, a given anonymous writing began to circulate is matter of public knowledge. The allegations of tradition on these points are relatively trustworthy, especially if free from (and still more if opposed to) apologetic interest. Contrariwise, the author’s name in the case of an anonymous work is necessarily known to very few (though a matter of conjecture to multitudes later, and increasingly so as controversy regarding the content seeks on the one side to clothe it with authority, on the other to disparage it). In the case of the Revelation ascribed to “ John ”

the original "prophecies" were doubtless (as usual) anonymous. The Ephesian editor who issues the work in Greek, prefacing it with introductory "letters" to the seven churches of Asia (cc. 1-3), and supplementing it with an epilogue (22, 6-21), ascribes the visions to "John." He takes the more questionable, but in his time not unusual, further liberty of adding to the message, continuing the seer's employment of the first person singular on his own account. As matter of conjecture the name of the Apostle John would be as natural to an Ephesian editor of 93 A. D. as it is unnatural when compared with the real implications of the "prophecies" themselves; for these distinctly refer to "the twelve Apostles of the Lamb" in the third person. This ancient debate on the authorship of Revelation, however, can never be settled by appeal to tradition. It belongs to internal criticism.

In the case of the Gospels, also, the author's name was not at first a matter of public concern. Until other products of similar kind came into rival circulation, creating the need for discrimination, the Gospel used in any given community was simply "the" Gospel. Matthew is in fact still quoted under just this designation by the Didache and Justin Martyr. It is exceptional (significantly so) when enough interest is taken in the question of the authorship of a "prophecy" to attach to it the name of "an Apostle of the Lord." Still more is it significant to find even Gospels condescending to be distinguished by names; most of all when, as in the cases of our Mark and Luke, the names are those of men who were not Apostles, names whose mention in this connection can hardly be accounted for unless in some way, direct or indirect, they really had a part in the production of the work.

Accordingly, when in addition to naming the author early tradition positively affirms that the so-called Gospel of "Mark" appeared at Rome some time after the death of the chief Apostle to whom it attributes the story related, the report is by no means to be despised. As respects both place and date this statement is not in the interest of apologetic; it was rather found inconvenient. As respects the provenance it tells something which belongs to public knowledge, something which if

untrue could and would meet contradiction, unless the allegation were too long delayed; something which later tradition actually does its best to counteract by affirming for subsequent Gospels an origin in Palestine by direct undertaking of one or more of the original Apostles.

Respect for tradition will be greatest where there is least evidence of an attempt to adapt it to later opinion. Unfortunately the tradition regarding the provenance of Mark gives strong indications of being later in origin than the tradition regarding its authorship and (approximate) date, and seems to be, in part, if not wholly, the fruit of early conjecture, embroidering the meagre statement of older authorities with ingenious inference of a nature tending to enhance the authority of the Gospel.

Scholars are well aware that there is but one really ancient tradition regarding the origin of any of the Gospels, and that single Gospel is not unnaturally the oldest, Mark. It is the tradition cited by Papias himself from an unnamed "Elder" obtained (apparently) during the period of his enquiries antecedent to the writing of his Interpretations of the Lord's Oracles. This period of enquiry probably did not extend later than 117 A.D.

We repeat: Only one primitive tradition of Gospel origins exists. For in spite of an enormous amount of darkening of counsel, what Papias states regarding Matthew is not a tradition. It does not even pretend to be. Papias simply declares that the precepts (λόγια) he proposes to expound were recorded in "Hebrew" by Matthew. In this statement he merely adopts the general assumption of his age (140-150 A.D.), an assumption based on two things: (1) the title *κατὰ Ματθαῖον*; ¹ (2) the language of the book. The assumption, as we all know, is in both elements demonstrably contrary to fact. Contrari-

¹ This title is probably based on conjecture attaching to Matt. 9, 9, in comparison with Mark 2, 14. Matt. 9, 9, in turn rests on the gloss *ὁ τελώνης* in the table of the apostolate taken up in 10, 3. The gloss is an attempt to find room in the list for the *τελώνης*, and was probably intended to attach to "Bartholomew." It is a practical parallel to many other attempts (e.g., of the *β* text) to meet the same difficulty.

wise, what Papias states regarding Mark is a tradition. It is avowedly derived from "the Elder," probably the same individual from whom Eusebius informs us Papias cited numerous "traditions" (*παραδόσεις*), and who had the name so common in Palestine of "John." Elsewhere¹ we have ventured to identify this primitive authority with John of Jerusalem, middle link in the succession of "Elders" in that church between James, the Lord's brother (ob. 62), and Judas (ob. 135). The death of this "Elder John," whom Irenaeus (as Eusebius so clearly demonstrates) had confounded with the Apostle, is placed by Epiphanius in a year of probable martyrdoms for Palestine when Trajan repressed the second Jewish uprising (117 A.D.). But the tradition which Papias reports must be distinguished from the interpretative comment of Papias' own which follows it. The tradition occupies the first part of the sentence, including no more than the words: "Mark, who had been (or, became) the *ἐρμηνευτής* of Peter, wrote down as much as he remembered both of the doings and sayings of Christ, but not in order." Papias seems to be employing this statement of "the Elder" to justify his own partial reliance on a nonapostolic source (Mark).

The precepts of the Lord (*κυριακὰ λόγια*) which Papias interpreted in his Exegesis² were drawn from Matthew. No other course is conceivable; for to Papias, as to his contemporaries, Matthew was "the Gospel," the complete and apostolic record of the things said and done by the Lord in their (chronological) order. However, Papias did feel justified in also drawing to some extent from Mark, although he acknowledges that "Mark was not a follower of the Lord, but afterwards, as I said [in a passage no longer extant], of Peter." Papias defends his use of Mark by explaining that if (as the Elder had declared) this evangelist's "order" was inaccurate, he may nevertheless be trusted, because while the nature of Peter's preaching, which Mark recorded, made chronological order impracticable, the

¹ See Fourth Gospel in *Research and Debate*, 1912.

² Readings in the mss. vary between singular and plural in the title of Papias' work. He may have given collected "exegeses" received from "the Elders," or he may have given his own "interpretations" (*ἐρμηνεῖται*), supporting them by Palestinian tradition ("the living and abiding voice").

Elder's words implied that Mark's record of Peter's discourses was both accurate and complete. This attitude of Papias toward Matthew and Mark respectively corresponds with the uniform practice of his age in the use of Gospel material. It is thus closely reflected by his contemporary Justin, and is indeed that of the Apostolic Fathers generally. As between Synoptic parallels, quotations are made almost invariably on the basis of Matthew.¹

In commenting on "the Elder's" account of Mark, Papias, we note, refers not to anything related by "the Elder," or indeed by any informant. He refers merely to a previous statement of his own ("as I said"), a statement not preserved among the extant fragments. In this non-extant reference Papias had discussed the association of Mark with Peter. Zahn has shown² that his contention was probably based on 1 Peter 5, 13. For in spite of Harnack's exposure³ of some fallacies, the substance of Zahn's contention remains highly probable. It may be stated as follows: We may co-ordinate Eusebius' statement in H. E. iii. 39, 16, that Papias "used testimonies from the First Epistle of Peter," with his earlier statement in H. E. ii, 15, 2, coupling "Papias" with Clement of Alexandria as testifying that Mark was written in Rome and that this is indicated by (Peter), when he calls the city symbolically Babylon, an obvious reference to 1 Peter 5, 13.

Zahn's reasoning is to the effect that Papias, as well as Clement (Hypotyposes, cited by Eusebius, H. E. vi. 14, 6), assigned the writing of the Gospel of Mark to "Rome itself"; and that, of the two writers appealed to, it was not Clement but Papias who based this assertion on 1 Peter 5, 13. For, while Clement's testimony to the Roman origin of Mark

¹ Note the comment of Swete (Commentary on Mark, p. xxxiv) on the complaint of Victor of Antioch (ob. ca. 550 A.D.) of the entire lack of commentaries on Mark. "The cause is doubtless partly to be sought in the prestige attaching to the first Gospel, which was regarded as the immediate work of an Apostle, and the greater fulness of both St. Matthew and St. Luke. Moreover, St. Mark was believed even by Irenaeus to have been written after St. Matthew."

² *Einleitung* (2d ed.), II, pp. 19 f., 214 f.; cf. pp. 22, 35.

³ "Pseudo-Papianisches," in *Zeitschrift für N. T. Wissenschaft*, III (1902), p. 159.

does form part of his comments on 1 Peter 5, 13 (showing his dependence on Papias), Clement himself nowhere adopts the "ground-idea" that the Epistle was written from Rome.

The argument that Clement derived the Gospel from Rome, but not the Epistle, is unconvincing. But Papias "confirmed" (συνεπιμαρτυρεῖ) the story of Clement's Hypotyposes, and to exclude from this confirmation his location of it at "Rome" is violent. We may therefore confidently attribute to Papias the statement that Mark was written in Rome. We can also say with confidence that Papias did not base this statement upon tradition (whatever independent knowledge he may have had as to the provenance of the Gospel), but upon an allegorical interpretation of the words ἐν Βαβυλῶνι in 1 Peter 5, 13. Later writers such as Irenaeus and Clement merely repeat and elaborate the statement. These two writers are in fact independently known to use Papias' work for such information, and could not be expected either to ignore or contradict his statement regarding the provenance of Mark. On this point they have nothing of their own to tell. They do show, however, a natural disposition to enhance the importance of the Gospel by enlarging upon the testimony, and to make the Apostle's responsibility for it as great as possible without actual contradiction of Papias' words. Thus Irenaeus repeats his predecessor's statement for substance, taking the aorist γενόμενος in its natural sense as explanatory both of the qualifications and limitations of Mark. He had been (said Papias) Peter's ἐρμηνευτής. Irenaeus takes this to mean the "translator" of Peter's oral discourses. So do all subsequent writers. We are justified in assuming that they correctly understood the Greek term; for Papias himself indicates that he also had the same idea by offsetting the authenticated and (as it were) official "translation" of Peter's discourses with the statement that Matthew's written record of the λόγια had no official "interpreter." Matthew left them "in the Hebrew," and "everyone translated them as best he could." It was, indeed, in part this lack of authoritative rendering for the Apostle's record which justified Papias' own "translations" (ἐρμηνεῖαι), and to these he "did not hesitate to subjoin" authenticated, autochthonous

traditions as a defense against arbitrary and "alien" perversions. For he had no higher respect than his successor Irenaeus for Gnostic "twisters of the Lord's oracles" (ῥαδιουργοῦντες τὰ λόγια τοῦ Κυρίου). These were "bad interpreters of things well said" (κακοὶ ἐξηγηταὶ τῶν καλῶς εἰρημένων).¹ In the Greek no other sense can be obtained from the statement than that Mark accompanied Peter for the purpose of translating his discourses (whether orally and immediately, or subsequently and in writing) into another language. This, then, may be set down as the conception entertained by Papias.

Whether "the Elder" (who in our view spoke Aramaic and was not directly accessible to Papias) had really in mind this kind of relation between Mark and Peter is at least doubtful; for it involves great difficulties, as Zahn and others have shown. Indeed the title of "translator" is unknown to the New Testament. As a number of critics have pointed out,² the Elder may have used the word מַתְּרָגְמָן, still current in the modern form of "dragoman," whose office is akin to that of courier. Papias, as may be seen by his repeated references to "translation," was concerned about this factor of true exegesis. So perhaps was his Gnostic predecessor Basilides, who claimed the authority of Glaukias, another interpreter (ἐρμηνεύς) of Peter. Papias, as we shall see, takes the reference in 1 Peter 5, 13 to prove a renewed association of Mark with Peter at Rome, after his association with Paul. Of the credibility of this we must enquire later; but to reason thus from the mere report of a report to the exact term used by the Elder is precarious in the extreme. We have no reason to impute to him the idea drawn by Papias from First Peter, and even if he used the exact equivalent of the Greek term ἐρμηνευτής, it need imply no more than an association with Peter corresponding to the expression of Acts 13, 5, εἶχον δὲ Ἰωάννην ὑπηρέτην, and to Luke 1, 2, where under ὑπηρετᾷ τοῦ λόγου the same Mark is certainly included, as well as to 2 Tim. 4, 11, where Paul describes the function of Mark as διακονία. This is in fact the rank and office which

¹ Irenaeus, Haer. i. 1, 1.

² So, e.g., Moffatt, Introduction to the New Testament (2d ed.), p. 186, note 1, citing Schlatter, Kirche in Jerusalem.

every New Testament reference would lead us to ascribe to Mark. We might for example expect that "when Peter came to Antioch" (Gal. 2, 11), after the departure of Paul and Silas on the second missionary journey, the Apostle would take with him Mark in the same capacity of *ὑπηρέτης* in which he had previously served Paul and Barnabas on the first part of the first missionary journey, and subsequently had served Barnabas alone. In general this relation of Mark to Peter would be probable from the references in Acts 10-12. In particular it is made almost unavoidable by the fact that, just before this journey of Peter, Mark had returned to Jerusalem from Pamphylia more or less under a cloud (Acts 13, 13); whereas immediately after it (Acts 15, 38) he is back again in Antioch, whence he accompanies Barnabas his "cousin" (Col. 4, 10) to Cyprus. He can hardly have revisited Antioch on his own account. If he accompanied Peter it was doubtless in his usual capacity of *ὑπηρέτης*, or *διάκονος*.

We therefore quite agree with Zahn that the words of John the Elder are stretched wholly beyond their legitimate meaning when taken as applying to a preaching of Peter at Rome in Aramaic, "interpreted" by Mark into Greek (or Latin!). Zahn appears to be wholly justified in maintaining that the association of Apostle and *ἐρμηνευτής*-מְתוּרְגֵּמַן referred to by "the Elder" does not pass the limits in time of that period in Peter's career known to us from Acts 1-15, during most of which Mark was a youth in his mother Mary's house in Jerusalem.

It may or may not be possible to give the Elder's words the "figurative" sense proposed by Zahn: "Mark, who (in so doing) became the interpreter of Peter, wrote down," etc.; but it is certain that they cannot be used in support of any other association of Mark with Peter than that of which we read in Acts. The later interpretations of it which begin with Papias' attempt to build on 1 Peter 5, 13, are responsible for the contradiction and difficulty. At this point, however, we take leave of Zahn, who refuses to admit that the misconception can go back to Papias and ascribes it all to the misunderstanding of later Fathers.

Returning, then, to the later development of the tradition, we see Papias' personal contribution to have been the locating of Mark's service as *ἐρμηνευτής* to Peter at Rome. The association affirmed by "the Elder" guaranteed Mark's qualifications as evangelist. The more definite specification of its date and circumstances greatly enhanced these qualifications by suggesting the completeness and accuracy of his record of Peter's teaching. In fact, Papias takes up every minutest detail of the Elder's testimony *seriatim* and dwells upon it. *ὅσα ἐμνημόνευσεν* had said the Elder. This (so Papias argues) implied that Mark's record of the precepts (*λόγια*), while less complete than Matthew, "omitted nothing that he had heard." Obviously the second Gospel cannot compare in completeness of recorded *λόγια* with the first. But Papias will not admit that Mark has any real defect. As a record of Peter's discourses it is complete. *ἀκριβῶς ἔγραψεν*, the Elder had testified. Papias reiterates that Mark "made no error (*οὐδὲν ἤμαρτεν*)," and "was careful to set down nothing falsely." Per contra, the Elder had undeniably declared that Mark's "order" was at fault (*οὐ μέντοι τάξει*). Papias therefore explains, limits, minimizes, this admitted shortcoming by every means in his power. He depicts the circumstances of the preaching which Mark heard. Unlike Matthew, whose design of making a systematic compend of the Lord's precepts (*σύνταξις τῶν κυριακῶν λόγων* — var. *λογίων*) is self-evident from the Gospel that bears his name, and who may therefore be regarded as furnishing the basis of comparison, Peter merely related such anecdotes as were practically "suited to the occasion" (*πρὸς τὰς χρείας*). Mark's record, therefore, is even on this score "without fault," since its order is at least a correct transcript of the preaching of the great Apostle. The Romans might be supposed to have previously obtained from Matthew their knowledge of the precepts (*λόγια*), the "commandments" (*ἐντολαί*) delivered by the Lord to the faith," as Papias terms them in the preceding context. This supposition is in fact actually made by his transcriber, Irenaeus.

In point of "order" there is in reality a very striking difference between Matthew and Mark. Matt. 4-14 completely reconstructs the Markan order of the ministry in Galilee

(though only to make it more artificial). Papias seems to regard the one Gospel (Matthew) as representing a systematic "compend of the Lord's oracles" (σύνταξις τῶν κυριακῶν λογίων), whereas the other (Mark) represents a mere collocation of anecdotes selected for practical edification on various occasions (λεχθέντα ἢ πραχθέντα; πρὸς τὰς χρείας). This shows quite remarkable appreciation for so primitive a critic of the difference in form and structure between the two Gospels; but at the same time it confirms the impression we get from his use of First John, Revelation, and First Peter, that like the rest of his generation (and indeed inevitably) he was after all in the main dependent upon written sources, the "books" which he affects to disparage.

In thus falling back upon the Elder's testimony as to Mark's lack of "order" (οὐ μέντοι τάξει) Papias is not, as Moffatt strangely alleges, referring to "style rather than chronological sequence";¹ for it is chronological sequence only, and not style, which would be affected by the difference between being "a follower of the Lord" and being "afterwards a follower of Peter." Papias is merely excusing Mark's inability to relate καθεξῆς (as Luke purports to do²) by the fact (implied in the aorist γενόμενος) that at the time of writing his association with Peter had ceased. He elaborates this implication of the Elder's statement by reference to some no longer extant affirmation of his own, based (as we have seen) on 1 Peter 5, 13. For (as we have also seen) the question of the "order" (τάξις) had very early, and quite unavoidably, become a matter of serious concern. The disappearance of first-hand testimony would inevitably bring this about in the absence of written records.

What then was the real meaning of the participle γενόμενος? Irenaeus quite naturally infers that death had removed Peter at the time of Mark's writing; otherwise the evangelist could have learned the true order by enquiry from him. Later writers,

¹ Op. cit., pp. 188-189.

² Neither καθεξῆς nor τάξει apart from the context need mean more than "consecutively." Spoken of the letters of the alphabet, the "order" implied would be the conventional. Spoken of the events of sacred story, no other order can be thought of than that of real occurrence, especially when such corrections of Mark's order are made as that in Luke 3, 18-20.

such as Clement of Alexandria, dislike to admit a post-apostolic origin for the Gospel. They therefore maintain that the Apostle was still alive, as the ambiguity of the expression *γενόμενος* allows. Their assumption, however, is shown to be incorrect by the difficulty in which they at once find themselves involved. They can no longer explain Mark's failure to avail himself of Peter's knowledge. Clement's statement, for example, that Peter "learned of" Mark's undertaking, but "neither directly forbade nor encouraged it," is transparently inadequate. It does not remove the difficulty, but merely restates it. The enquirer returns with the further question, Why did the Apostle manifest such indifference? Eusebius seeks to improve upon Clement by making Peter's information come from "the Spirit," and by adding (as against seeming indifference) that he "commended the Gospel to the churches." But Mark's failure to consult Peter still remains a mystery. The Latin Adumbrations of Clement of Alexandria make the auditors, at whose solicitation Mark recorded the words of Peter, members of the imperial court at Rome of equestrian rank. Finally the late Synopsis Scripturae of Pseudo-Athanasius tries to meet the objection, and at the same time make the apostolic sanction of the Gospel letter-perfect, by changing the preaching of Peter to dictation. But now what is gained as respects accuracy of transcription is more than counterbalanced by the unrelieved contradiction of Matthew as respects order of events.

The apologetic motive for these later changes in the tradition is so transparent ¹ that it would not be worth while to record them were it not for its close correspondence with the earlier. For we obtain thus a clear view of the trend, while we pursue an unbroken line backward from the later writers to Clement, from Clement to Papias, and from Papias to the "Elder." In all cases save one, Papias' theory of the provenance based on 1 Peter 5, 13 is adopted. "The Elder's" indefinite statement that Mark "had been" an *ἐρμηνευτής* of Peter, becomes

¹ Cf. Swete (op. cit., p. xxvi): "Later forms of the story exaggerate St. Peter's part in the production. Even Origen seems to represent the Apostle as having personally controlled the work (*ὡς Πέτρος ὑφηγήσατο αὐτῷ*), whilst Jerome (ad Hedib.) says that the Gospel of St. Mark was written 'Petro narrante et illo scribente.'"

progressively in later development a more and more detailed description of Peter's preaching at Rome, with Mark in attendance as reporter of the discourse. In reality there is nothing back of Papias save *ἐν Βαβυλῶνι* in 1 Peter 5, 13 to suggest that Peter ever set foot in Rome. To this *ἐν Βαβυλῶνι* we must return presently; but meantime a word must be devoted to the solitary variant in the tradition of Roman provenance for the Gospel.

The single exception is the statement of Chrysostom (Hom. 1 in Matt.) that Mark wrote his Gospel in Egypt at the request of his hearers there. As Zahn quite justly observes, this solitary variation is too late in date, and too obviously dependent on the ordinary earlier form (hearers requesting the work) to deserve our credence. It merely adapts the usual story to the Alexandrian episcopal succession, which begins (not perhaps without historical reason) with "Mark." Moreover its origin is easily accounted for. Swete¹ very reasonably explains it by the ambiguity of the statement of Eusebius (H. E. ii. 16) regarding the work of Mark in Egypt in "preaching the gospel of which he is a compiler" (*Μάρκον πρῶτον φασιν ἐπὶ τῆς Αἰγύπτου στείλαμενον τὸ εὐαγγέλιον ὃ δὴ συνεγράψατο κηρύξαι*). The fact that the same statement has led Jerome (Vir. ill. c. 8) to declare that Mark "took up the Gospel which he had compiled and went to Egypt" (*adsumpto itaque evangelio quod ipse confecerat perrexit Aegyptum*) strongly corroborates Swete's suggestion. The same ambiguous statement very obviously underlies this more cautious declaration, as well as that of Epiphanius (Haer. 51, 6) that after writing the Gospel at Rome, Mark was sent by Peter to Egypt.²

The possibility of a sojourn of Mark in Alexandria is of course entirely open; and the belief, as we have seen, gave rise to a late modification in the usual form of the tradition of the provenance of the Gospel. The two questions are mutually independent; but it will be worth while to refer to the cautious language of Swete, who in his well known Commentary³ leaves open the possibility of such a sojourn between the time when

¹ Commentary on Mark, p. xxxix.

² *ἐν Ῥώμῃ ἐπιτρέπεται τὸ εὐαγγέλιον ἐκθέσθαι, καὶ γράψας ἀποστέλλεται ὑπὸ τοῦ ἀγίου Πέτρου εἰς τὴν τῶν Αἰγυπτίων χώραν.*

³ Pp. xviii ff.

Mark is last seen in Acts leaving Antioch for Cyprus as attendant on Barnabas (Acts 15, 39), and his reappearance some ten years later in Paul's entourage. Swete would account for the "widespread series of traditions connecting St. Mark with the foundation of the Alexandrian church" by the supposition that Paul's original commendation of Mark to the churches of the Lycus Valley, referred to in the words *περὶ οὗ ἐλάβετε ἐντολὰς* (Col. 4, 10), was occasioned by the proposal of Mark, then still in Cyprus, to visit these churches. This visit, Swete suggests, may have been abandoned for the mission to Egypt, whence Mark had proceeded to Rome. Swete, however, is properly explicit in pointing out that this whole possible episode of a stay in Alexandria belongs solely to the "personal history of Mark," and has no relation (at least in the period of authentic tradition) to the question of the provenance of the Gospel. In the second, third, and fourth centuries all parties are agreed in making the view of Papias fundamental. And with much reason, for Papias was the fountainhead of tradition regarding Gospel origins, having set himself, at just the critical juncture when authentic Palestinian tradition was being destroyed by the dispersal of the mother church in 135 A.D., to vindicate and preserve the apostolic *παράδοσις* as a bulwark against Gnostic vagary. As regards ancient testimony to the provenance of our oldest Gospel it is certainly true that "all roads lead to Rome." But not beyond the great junction point of Papias. That Papias affirmed this we have already seen reason to believe. It would also appear that he based his statement on the reference to "Babylon" in 1 Peter 5, 13. But was this his only ground? Did the belief rest wholly on the Scripture? Or was not the Scripture, as in so many other cases, at least in part an afterthought, confirming rather than originating belief?

Unfortunately for our present enquiry no reference to Rome appears in that ancient and apparently trustworthy tradition which Papias reports as from "the Elder." If such there was, it formed part of a highly apologetic and controversial comment, whose aim was to secure respect for a certain nonapostolic Gospel (Mark) which the author of the Exegeses thinks worthy of use alongside of the recognized apostolic standard (Mat-

thew). Besides Matthew's recognized σύνταξις τῶν κυριακῶν λογίων, Papias has determined to make use of Mark's ἀπομνημονεύματα of the preaching of Peter. He has a tradition of "the Elder" to cite in its favor, but in itself the Elder's endorsement of Mark is not unqualified. It has almost a patronizing tone. Papias repeats and elaborates upon it to make it apparent that nevertheless Mark may be accepted as an "errorless" transcript of the preaching of Peter. The description of the preaching agrees with what Eusebius describes (H. E. ii, 15, 2) as witness of Papias in confirmation (συνεπιμαρτυρεῖ) of Clement, that Mark attended Peter, and that in the Epistle "which they say was composed at Rome" Peter indicates this city figuratively in the words of 1 Peter 5, 13. In the clause, "in his Former Epistle which they say was composed at Rome," Eusebius is not quoting Papias, of course, but unspecified tradition (φασίν); but we cannot escape the clear statement that Papias declared the word "Babylon" in 1 Peter 5, 13 to be used symbolically (τροπικώτερον) for Rome. Whether, therefore, this exegesis represents Papias' only reason for locating the association of Mark with Peter at Rome, or whether it be in addition to some other, perhaps a reason of greater moment, we must at all events follow up this road and see whether or not the Epistle in question really does imply it.

The passage, 1 Peter 5, 13, makes reference to Mark in manifestly symbolic language as the writer's (spiritual) "son." It refers to the Christian brotherhood whence greetings are sent to the persecuted Pauline churches of Asia Minor as their "sister-election (συνεκλεκτή) in Babylon." What the author really means by this symbolism (for some part at least is symbolic) we must enquire for ourselves hereafter. Papias, in his interpretation, is clearly influenced by the Revelation of John (cc. 16-19), a book by which (as Eusebius plainly indicates) he and his successors down to Irenaeus were greatly affected. Indeed, we are credibly informed by a writer¹ who seems to have used the work of Papias that he vouched for its ἀξιόπιστον. In

¹ Andreas of Caesarea in Apoc., preface and c. 34, sermon 12. By error, Andreas' transcript of Rev. 12, 9 is included in the Lightfoot-Harmer edition of the Apostolic Fathers as part of the quotation from Papias numbered Fragt. xi.

all probability Papias regarded the book in the same light as his contemporary Justin, who cites it (probably in dependence on Papias) as "a vision granted to one of ourselves, an Apostle of the Lord named John." Rev. 16, 19-19, 10 is the classic passage for the application to Rome of the prophecies of the Old Testament against "Babylon"; and Papias is of all men the one we should expect to apply this key (correctly or otherwise) to the symbolism of 1 Peter 5, 13. Against the supposition of its correctness, and in fact against the whole idea of an association of Mark with Peter at Rome, are the notorious difficulties in the way of this ardently defended belief.

For the only ancient support of a sojourn of Peter at Rome is the passage now under consideration, interpreted as Papias interprets it.¹ Peter certainly had not been at Rome throughout the period covered by the Pauline Epistles, still less had Mark been his minister there. Did he go to Rome after Paul's death, and there draw to himself Paul's former associates and helpers, Silvanus and Mark? This is what all defenders of the authenticity of First Peter from Papias to Sir William Ramsay would have us believe. I need hardly add that "there are many adversaries."

Present limitations forbid our entering fully upon the question of the authenticity of First Peter. Briefly let me acknowledge that continued study and reflection leads me more and more definitely toward the more radical of the alternatives left open eighteen years ago in my Introduction. O. D. Foster's study on the Literary Relations of First Peter² shows the line of proof which convinces me that the epistle cannot be earlier than the persecution of Domitian, a date which even Ramsay admits as intrinsically the most probable. The situation the writer of it confronts is that of 85 to 95 A.D., and to its "fiery

¹ Clement of Rome (5, 4, 5) and Dionysius of Corinth (ap. Euseb. H. E. ii, 15, 8) conjoin the martyrdoms of Peter and Paul, but Clement, at least, does not imply that both took place at Rome. Witnesses from the end of the second century, such as Dionysius and Caius, are too late to be regarded as independent. For a parallel instance of inference from First Peter as sole apparent basis for journeys attributed to the Apostle, see Eusebius, H. E. iii, 1. Dionysius (ibid. ii, 25) even makes Peter joint founder with Paul of the church in Corinth (!), apparently on the basis of 1 Cor. 1, 12.

² Yale University Press, 1913.

trial " we may well refer the apostasies acknowledged by some of the victims of Pliny in this same region, who in 112 A.D. testified that they had renounced this faith " twenty-five years ago " (Epist. 96, 6, ad Trajan.). A date ca. 87 A.D. is fatal to Petrine authorship.

On the other hand, critical surgery cannot rescue moral at the cost of literary integrity. Harnack's attempt against the beginning and end of the Epistle is inadmissible, because the severed parts attest organic unity with the trunk, and vice versa. From the ground their blood cries out against him. There remains no alternative but pseudonymity; and this has confirmation from the very elements we are now discussing. For in 1 Peter 5, 13 symbolism is undeniably employed. The writer shrouds his entourage and his place of writing in mystery. Like the self-styled " John " who addresses the endangered churches of Asia from " the Isle of Patmos " where he sojourns " for the word of God and the testimony of Jesus," so " Peter " writes from the midst of the church " in Babylon, elect together with you." Application of the mask of symbolism to the specific point of entourage and provenance is the classic symptom of pseudonymity. The reason is self-evident. To say plainly " Rome," or " Ephesus," would raise embarrassing questions of fact.

Taking First Peter, then, to be certainly earlier than Revelation, but with great probability later than the death of both Paul and Peter, what will be the natural interpretation of the symbolism at its beginning and end?

" Babylon " in 1 Peter 5, 13 is certainly no less symbolic in use than *συνεκλεκτή* and *ὁ υἱὸς μου* in the same verse, and the term *συνεκλεκτή* corresponds with the *ἐκλεκτοὶ παρεπίδημοι διασπορᾶς* of 1, 1, " the elect of the dispersion." The latter are the recipients of the epistle, the Pauline churches of Asia Minor now exposed to the full force of a fiery persecution. Indeed this persecution may well be the same which the author of Hebrews anticipates in a letter probably sent shortly before in the reverse direction. The former group, who join with the writer of the epistle and speak through him words of encouragement and support, correspond to one great branch of Judaism in the

period whose beginning is marked by the Deutero-Isaian songs, the "captivity" in Babylon. As in Israel according to the flesh, so also in the Christian commonwealth, the two groups of exiles, the "captivity" in Babylon (cf. Rev. 18, 4) and the "dispersion" (or "sowing"; see verses 23-25) among the Gentiles are "elect sisters." Both look forward to a common deliverance and a joint inheritance in the day of redemption. The author of the epistle avails himself of this classic symbolism of Jewish literature not only in 5, 13, but also in 1, 1. It is well suited to his purpose of bringing two great branches of the Christian church, the "brotherhood throughout the world" (*ἀδελφότης ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ*), into relations of mutual support, sympathy, and encouragement.

For this purpose the personal names also are appropriately chosen. "Silvanus" was joint founder with Paul of some of these Asian communities. "Mark" had been Paul's intermediary with at least one of them (Col. 4, 10). But most of all the name of "Peter" was well-nigh indispensable, and in an age wherein pseudonymity is habitual in writings for edification of this type it would raise no scruple or protest.

No suggested name of inferior authority ¹ meets the requirements implied in the epistle itself. Only some elder of elders and shepherd of shepherds to the whole flock of Christ could appropriately exhort the church leaders of so many provinces to the steadfastness of martyrdom. As such speaks the "fellow-elder and witness of the sufferings of Christ" in 1 Peter 5, 1-5. Again, it belongs not to every new convert to commend Silvanus, Paul's yoke-fellow, as "faithful in my estimation" (5, 12); least of all to endorse the gospel preached by Paul as "the true grace of God." Such a message to such recipients would seem presumptuous, the commendation of Paul's fellow-worker patronizing, the reference to Mark an intrusion, from any lesser dignitary than the chief Apostle of all. It is therefore neither by accident nor mistake that Peter's name heads this epistle. The beginning corresponds with the end, however little this literary and Pauline "Peter" may correspond

¹ On "Barnabas" as suggested author, see below.

with the Galilean fisherman we know of through Synoptic story.¹

An artistic literary work of the period of Domitian, Pauline in structure, doctrine, and even phraseology, and addressed to the Pauline churches of Asia, under the name of Peter, can only be pseudonymous. But even were the letter an authentic missive of the Apostle Peter, the reference to the ἐκλεκτοὶ διασπορᾶς in 1, 1, taken together with its corresponding term the ἀδελφότης ὑμῶν ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ (5, 9), would forbid our taking the expression ἐν Βαβυλῶνι in any narrow or concrete sense. As it is, Rome is probably meant, but the expression is purposely veiled, and the symbolism (like most of the imagery of this epistle) requires to be interpreted by Isaiah rather than by Revelation. The key will be found in this classic Jewish usage. It shows that the "elect sisterhood" in the author's mind is on the one side that of the "Dispersion" (διασπορά), on the other that of the "Captivity" (ἡ συνεκλεκτή ἐν Βαβυλῶνι). The latter of course represents the main stock. "Peter" speaks for it, because he is the leader of the original Twelve. If we conceive it to be the actual Peter who speaks, we meet difficulties, among them the question what he means by ἡ ἐν Βαβυλῶνι συνεκλεκτή, and why allegory should be used, if this be allegory. If "Peter" be a pseudonym, the passage will still afford our strongest evidence that Peter's martyrdom took place as alleged, in Rome. But neither ancients nor moderns would be justified in inferring from it a Roman ministry of Peter, with Mark as his "interpreter."

The mere fact that the author of the epistle probably substitutes Peter's name for his own has, therefore, no direct bearing on the question whether he believed in a sojourn of Peter at Rome; for, whoever he be, he purposely avoids naming a real locality, and makes "Peter" speak not so much in behalf of a particular local body of Christians, as on behalf of the ἀδελφότης ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ, the whole body of the exiled people of God, among

¹ Against attempts such as Harnack's to cut off 1, 1 from the remainder, observe also the interconnection between this verse and 1, 23 (διασπορά—ἐκ σπορᾶς ἀφθάρτου); 2, 11 (παρεπιδήμους — ὡς παρεπιδήμους), and the dependence of James 1, 1, 10, 12, 18 on the same figure of the διασπορά.

whom the "elect in Babylon" are complementary to "the elect of the dispersion in Pontus, Galatia" etc., as Israel in captivity beyond the Euphrates is complementary to the Jewish Dispersion. The two "elect sisters" await in both cases a common redemption.

On the other hand, the personal names are necessarily real. The writer speaks "through Silvanus" because Silvanus together with Paul had been the founder of most of the churches now exposed to persecution among "the Elect of the Dispersion." He sends the greeting of "Mark" because Mark, follower first of Barnabas and Paul, then of Barnabas alone, and lastly of Paul alone, had first of all been an intimate associate, and very probably a convert, of Peter. Mark could thus be a link between Petrine and Pauline Christianity. Whether the writer thinks of the present abode of either Silvanus or Mark is problematical; but it is clear at all events that Mark has become a "personage," and if (as the tradition, the literary relations, and the dissemination give reason to believe) First Peter is really of Roman provenance, this mention is an indication to be added to those of the later Pauline Epistles that this trusted coworker of Paul continued after the Apostle's death at Rome, forming one of the bonds connecting the church of the metropolis with Paul's earlier mission field.

This interpretation of First Peter in its general purpose, and particularly with reference to the symbolic expressions at its beginning and end, which mask the actual personality of the writer and the real situation, must be presented here more or less dogmatically for lack of opportunity to develop evidence. It will serve, however, to indicate why the definite affirmations of Papias regarding the provenance of Mark, eagerly as they have been adopted by the later church writers, who look to Papias for all their knowledge of Gospel origins, are by no means to be taken without their proper "grain of salt." Zahn, of course, is very easily convinced of the authenticity not only of First Peter, but of Second Peter also. For defensive criticism the rule is simple: All canonical writings bearing the name of Peter, authentic; all uncanonical, pseudonymous. Even Zahn, however, feels constrained by the fundamentally Pauline char-

acter of the epistle to make its real author Silas rather than Peter. Professor McGiffert has a theory of his own to account for its peculiarities: First Peter is the only original and genuine Epistle of Barnabas; the insertion of the name "Peter" is an intrusion either accidental or designed. Let us leave *sub judice* these attempts to explain how an epistle which by contents, phraseology, purpose, and address is Pauline can appear under the name of Peter, and limit our claim to the undeniable fact that in resting on 1 Peter 5, 13 for his evidence that the scene of Mark's attendance as "translator" on the discourses of Peter was Rome, Papias took very dubious ground. "Peter" possibly took passage for Rome by this conveyance; but his passport is not yet viséd, for Papias' endorsement will not suffice. We must have better evidence before we admit him to residence.

Nevertheless, the value of Papias' testimony does not wholly disappear. We have some reason to believe that First Peter really was written from Rome. Authentic or pseudonymous, its literary relations, the use of the Pauline literature which had preceded, the use subsequently made of the epistle itself in these regions, its earliest circulation — these, taken together with its purpose and animus, are more favorable to derivation from Rome than from any other church. However fallacious the exegesis of the passage on which Papias rested his belief, the construction he followed can hardly have been suggested by it; for "Babylon" would naturally be taken in the literal sense. Clement of Alexandria, as we have seen, reverts to this. It is hardly probable that Papias' view of the epistle as a missive from Rome could have maintained itself had it been demonstrably at variance with the truth. Grant that the real author of the epistle does not mean to suggest Rome by the symbolic "Babylon," and that the mention of members of Paul's entourage (one of whom was at last accounts at Rome) is due only to his desire to commend his message to the Pauline churches addressed, still, the mention of Mark as Peter's "son" along with Silvanus in a Roman document of ca. 87 A.D. would by no means be without significance to our problem. It may not be a direct consequence of this linking of

Mark's name with Peter's that the Gospel which was understood to embody Peter's memorabilia of the Lord came to be designated *κατὰ Μάρκον*; but the characterization certainly points to Mark as a "personage" of growing authority among the Pauline churches at this period, an authority which would more and more tend to rest, as it has already in this passage begun to do, on his earlier relations with Peter, rather than on his later relations with Paul.

If then, First Peter be, as seems so probable, a Roman writing of ca. 87 A.D., it shows the special respect in which Mark was then held at Rome, and shows, moreover, as the principal basis for that respect, his long-past associations with Peter. The epistle extends the right hand of fellowship to the Asiatic churches of Paul, suffering under the great wave of Domitianic persecution which had shortly before evoked our Epistle to the Hebrews, and was destined not long after to bring forth the great Ephesian book of "Prophecy" issued as the "Revelation of John." The fact that not only "Peter" but "Mark," as Peter's spiritual "son," is for this purpose a name to conjure with is in significant parallelism with the phenomenon of a Gospel emanating (as tradition affirms) from the same region, at approximately the same period, which is understood to embody the *ἀπομνημονεύματα* of Peter, but is superscribed with the name of "Mark." From this point of view one can appreciate why the "Gospel according to Mark" really corresponds in some degree to the tradition that it represents the *ἀνέκδοτα* of Peter, notwithstanding its attitude of uncompromising Paulinism on debated questions of faith and practice.

From the question of Papias' opinion of the provenance of the epistle and its probable relation to fact, we may return to that of the Gospel. Papias believed both works to emanate from Rome. He grounds his belief on a dubious interpretation of a passage whose authenticity is subject to very serious dispute. At first sight this might appear almost fatal to our attempt to link tradition, as it appears after Papias, with historical report as it may have been before. But the real origin of Papias' belief is one thing, the proof-text he adduces in its support is another. The same reasoning which applies to First Peter ap-

plies with much greater force to the Gospel of Mark. I am not speaking now of the internal evidences of Roman origin displayed by the Gospel. These must be considered later. I do not refer to the evidences of early employment, which in the case of both writings are at least not unfavorable to Rome. The question is simply whether Papias would be apt to take up the idea that Mark was a Roman gospel, or having taken it up be able persistently to maintain and transmit it, if such were not the fact. Considering how vital to his enquiry this question was, not a merely incidental question like that of the provenance of First Peter, but of direct concern to his principal enquiry; considering also that it was probably not a difficult matter, either for Papias himself or for his opponents, to know where this primitive Gospel first came into general currency, it is not unreasonable to hold that some more or less definite knowledge must have been the real basis of his belief.

Quite apart from this hopeful probability, the results of our critical analysis are by no means entirely destructive. On the contrary, they throw new and important light upon the personal history of Mark, the significance of which increases with the probability of the Roman provenance of the so-called First Epistle of Peter a few years only after the Gospel. The effect of these results is sharply to differentiate an apologetic, legendary, or at least unverifiable, later development, from a nucleus of authentic tradition, perfectly consonant with all we can learn both from Lukan and Pauline sources. On this side of the age of the great Apologists our enquiry lays bare, it is true, a persistent apologetic, dating back at least to Papias, if not to the author of First Peter himself, an apologetic which is bent on binding the aged Peter and carrying him away whither he would not, to become the forefather of the Roman papacy. With the methods of this apologetic we are all too familiar. By all means, whether with much persuasion or little, the chief Apostle must be induced to give his indorsement to Rome's succession and Rome's Gospel, to found the one and to preach, if not actually to dictate, the other. This is the animus of the whole body of tradition from Papias onward. But back of this lies a very different type, an older tradition traceable to Pales-

tine, refractory to the later attempts of Papias and others to mould it to apologetic and Roman interest. By this older tradition we do not mean the representation of First Peter, which rather forms (intentionally or otherwise) the starting-point for Roman glorification of the Gospel and see of Peter. We mean the quite dispassionate, almost disparaging, testimony of the Elder John of Jerusalem, corroborated as it is on the negative side by Matthew (and Luke) in their limitation of Peter's sphere to Jewish Christendom.

It is this Jerusalem Elder of about 100-117 who explains the title "According to Mark" by telling us (what we might reasonably have ourselves inferred from Acts 12, 12, 25; 13, 5, 13, and 15, 37-39), that Mark had been an interpreter for Peter, and had written down accurately, though not in order, such things as he remembered both of the sayings and doings of the Christ. Understood in its most natural sense (that sense which Zahn maintains to be not only admissible but alone admissible), the tradition refers to recollections set down at least a score of years after Mark's personal relations with Peter had permanently ceased. In this representation there is nothing improbable or unreasonable. On the contrary, it agrees not only with the internal characteristics of the Gospel, but also with what we learn from the mentions of Mark in the Pauline epistles written from Rome. These show, contrary to all possible anticipation, that the former associate of Peter and Barnabas, a worker originally in that Eastern field which according to Gal. 2, 1-10 had been allotted to Peter's evangelizing efforts, became subsequently, during that later period on which the Book of Acts sheds no light, an associate of Paul, and a worker in Greece and Italy. They show Rome itself at last accounts as his headquarters. The Elder's statement is thus curiously in harmony with what we know from Acts, and Acts alone, in regard to Mark's relations with Peter.

The Gospel of Mark itself, on the other hand, bears out what we know from the later Pauline Epistles alone as to his ultimate relations with Paul. Between the two stands the First Epistle of Peter (an admittedly Paulinistic writing) in which Mark has the same double relation as in the Gospel. For the Gospel, like

the Epistle, is Pauline as respects aim, standpoint, and (traditional) provenance; but as regards its evangelic data it is both traditionally, and to some extent as a matter of observed fact, a record of anecdotes derived from Peter.

We have no reason to suppose that John of Jerusalem took the slightest interest in the Epistles of Paul. We have no reason to imagine any acquaintance on his part with First Peter. Nevertheless what he has to say of Mark as author of the Gospel whose provenance later tradition attributes to Rome presents him in the same light as 1 Peter 5, 13, i.e. as Peter's spiritual "son." This lends no small corroboration to his testimony. First Peter, Acts, the Elder John—these three represent successive stages in the tradition which leads to the attachment of the name of Mark to the ἀπομνημονεύματα of Peter. Not the least important of these links is that wherein the Pauline encourager (from Rome?) of the Pauline churches of Asia under the fire of Domitian's persecution borrows the name of Peter, using also the names of Paul's lieutenants, Silvanus and Mark, as his intermediaries. In Epistle and Gospel alike the hands are the hands of Peter, but the voice is the voice of Paul. Papias' exegesis and criticism will hardly stand; but in attributing both Epistle and Gospel to Rome Papias falls in at least with certain striking features shared by these two writings. Both are Pauline to the core as regards questions of faith and practice. Nevertheless both would be understood as speaking not for Paul, but for Peter.

II. THE DISSEMINATION

CONTRARY to ordinary experience, tradition regarding the origin of Mark antedates most of the extant evidences of its employment. The statement of John of Jerusalem as to its authorship and relation to the anecdotes of Peter must date not later than 117 A.D. Outside the four canonical Gospels themselves, we have absolutely no trace in any correspondingly early writing of the existence of Mark. However, even this canonical employment is not without bearing on the question of its provenance. Considering that this was an anonymous Gospel, a writing whose most ardent champions did not venture to claim for it more than second-hand relation to one of the Apostles, the degree of respect shown for it by Matthew and Luke at the very threshold of the second century is truly extraordinary. This is difficult to account for unless the Gospel had already attained wide currency and acceptance, implying that it was vouched for in high quarters. A document which on its face makes so little pretense of authority could hardly be expected to attain such standing if emanating from some obscure region, undistinguished as the seat of any "apostolic" church.

The representative of the Jerusalem "Elders" deprecates, as we should expect, exaggerated dependence upon the Gospel of Mark. To take this written record as a complete, "ordered" account of Jesus' life and teaching, of directly apostolic authority, would be fatal to the claims of Jerusalem's own most cherished prerogative, its apostolic tradition of the Lord's words. Still, the Elder treats the book with consideration and respect. So much as Mark gave was really from "Peter," and was "accurately" recorded. Still greater respect than this is implied in the use made of Mark at a considerably earlier date by Matthew and Luke.

Mark's narrative and practically nothing else is adopted by our first canonical evangelist for his entire outline of Jesus' career. But the author of Matthew represents, by the consensus of ancient tradition with modern criticism, the same region and ecclesiastical connections as John of Jerusalem.

He probably does not antedate the Elder's testimony by more than a decade or so. It is insupposable that this Palestinian evangelist did not have access to at least as ample stores of evangelic διήγησις as Luke attests both by direct reference (Luke 1, 1) and by employment. He is likely, rather, to have sympathized with our fourth evangelist's complaints (John 20, 30; 21, 25) of an *embarras de richesse* on this score. Therefore when we find Matthew's outline so strictly limited to Markan material, and even the order of Mark unchanged save in one important regrouping (Matt. 8-9), we can only infer that this is due to the great authority already enjoyed by the earlier Gospel.

This inference from Matthew is re-enforced by the treatment accorded to Mark by Luke. Here again the degree of respect shown for the contents of Mark, and (in spite of the evangelist's endeavor to write *καθεξῆς*) even for its order, is so far beyond what its self-indicated origin would lead us to expect, that no other explanation seems available than that of quasi-authoritative acceptance.

This remarkable fact, that the non-apostolic Greek Gospel of Mark should by 100 A.D. have attained a currency and standing so completely dominant as to determine for all subsequent time the standard outline of Jesus' career, is of enormous significance. An age which has but recently accommodated itself to the conviction that Mark is the oldest of the Synoptic group, Matthew and Luke being independently dependent on it, may be pardoned for not immediately appreciating all its implications. One of them, however, is the following: Repetitions by one or both of Mark's satellites may not be taken off-hand as corroborations. They may be mere reflections of Mark. For corroboration we should require the added testimony of Paul, or of the Second Source (Q). When for example Luke (but not Matthew) takes over the Markan theory of the demonic recognition of Jesus as the Christ and Son of God,¹ we have not two witnesses for the fact, but only one witness, whose weight with later writers must be judged by this relation. Conversely

¹ See Bacon in *Zeitschrift für N. T. Wissenschaft*, VI (1905), pp. 153 ff.

when Matthew (but not Luke)' takes over Mark's idea that the parables were riddles intended to hide the mystery of the kingdom of God from "those without," we merely have evidence how greatly Matthew was controlled in his conceptions by even an erroneous theory of Mark. When, therefore, we come to a consideration of the peculiarities of Mark as respects Christology, eschatology, and otherwise, it will not do to argue: Such and such a phenomenon is not "Markan" because the same passage appears also in one or both of the two later Synoptists. Only in subordinate changes could Matthew and Luke depart from Mark. As a whole, the Markan outline and content was imposed upon them. The minor changes, aiming to effect improvements in geography (mainly in Matthew), rehabilitation of Peter, the Apostles, and the kindred of the Lord, restoration of the Davidic pedigree of Jesus, and the like, are all the more significant. But when we speak of the "Markan" outline, this must be understood to include that portion of Mark which has been taken over by Matthew and Luke. To judge how far this represented the general stream of gospel teaching we must compare it with Paul and the Q material, not merely with its own reflection in "triple tradition" material.

It is entirely erroneous to connect the Second Source with the name of "Matthew." This Apostle's name is never connected, in early tradition, with any other writing than our own first Gospel — a false ascription whose origin we can only conjecture. "Peter" thus remains as the only apostolic source of evangelic material *ἡ λεχθέντα ἡ πραχθέντα* for the earlier tradition; and the respectful treatment accorded by both Matthew and Luke to Mark, as compared to that accorded to Q material, corroborates the result.

When we leave the field of the canonical Gospels and come down to the pseudoapostolic composites of the second century, the earliest and most important is the so-called Gospel of Peter (140–150 A.D.?). In *Evangelium Petri* the fundamental narrative outline is again Markan, and the apostolic authority ap-

¹ The Markan idea of the "hardening of Israel" is adopted by all later evangelists. On this see below. Luke (Acts. 28, 26–27) and John (12, 40) welcome and extend the proof-texts (Isa. 6, 9). But only Matthew goes so far as to adopt Mark's theory of the teaching in parables as proving it. Cf. Luke 8, 9–10.

pealed to is "Peter." In fact, "Peter" now even speaks in the first person.

It was at about this period (125-140 A.D.) that the relatively late and dependent Greek Gospel of Matthew succeeded in ousting "Petrine" tradition from its commanding influence, this result being due to its vastly greater appeal to the post-apostolic demand for *ἐντολαὶ τῇ πίστει ὑπὸ τοῦ κυρίου δεδομένα*, and for direct apostolic authority; and the title *κατὰ Ματθαῖον* is not very much later in origin than the Gospel itself. Once the ancient glory of *ἀπομνημονεύματα* of Peter had been eclipsed by "Matthew," we begin to get pseudo-Matthean gospels. At the outset "Synoptic" tradition, as we call it, is nothing more nor less than the Gospel of Mark, filled out in the second generation with some minor attachments of relatively late and apocryphal anecdote, and with large supplements of discourse material (Q) taken from the so-called Second Source. There is no claim to any other apostolic authority than "Peter," until the Greek Gospel of Matthew enters the field with a problematic ascription to "Matthew," not traceable earlier than Papias. Finally, Ephesus, the great headquarters of Paulinism, shows sufficient independence to break away for considerable sections of the story from the stereotyped "Petrine" outline of Mark. As in the case of Matthew, tradition soon brings forward the claim of apostolic authorship in behalf of this last and best of the Gospels. Theophilus of Antioch (181 A.D.) maintains that it was written by the Apostle John.

The history of Mark in the formative period of the Gospels is therefore unique. A superstructure of unequalled authority is built upon a foundation of most modest claims. This is all the more significant in view of the rapid decline of this once dominant Gospel to a position of almost complete eclipse. It could not hope to maintain itself, once the larger Gospel of Matthew with its higher claims of apostolic authority had come into general use. As we see from Papias, the demand of the age was for a systematic compend of the divine oracles of the Lord (*σύνταξις τῶν κυριακῶν λόγιων*). It required a *nova lex*, a revealed Law like that proclaimed from Sinai, "commandments delivered by the Lord to the faith, which are derived from the truth

itself." On this score the mere "Memoirs of Peter" could not hope to compete with Matthew.

Even from the annalist's point of view, Mark took second rank. As a complete narrative "from the very first" down to the establishment of the new religion in the world's metropolis it was hopelessly outdistanced by the splendid double work attributed to Luke the companion of Paul, which also made pretensions to "order." The marvel is that a Gospel so completely superseded as Mark in the estimate of the post-apostolic age could manage to survive at all. Nothing but its one-time influence saved it; and the mutilated and reconstructed form in which we have it attests the pressure it went through before the newer and larger Gospels took its place in common employment. Its survival is unquestionably due in large part to the belief that it represents the preaching of Peter. Justin at Rome in 152 even refers to Mark 3, 17, as "written in his (i.e., Peter's) memoirs." But this tradition has no traceable foundation in the book itself. The Gospel obtained its first currency under the name of Mark; the name of Peter was superimposed later to increase and widen its authority. Had it been otherwise the title would certainly have been *κατὰ Πέτρον*, and it is impossible to imagine such a title displaced by the unpretentious *κατὰ Μάρκον*.

What, then, can be inferred on the score of provenance from the extraordinarily high and wide-spread authority of Mark? Had the authority, position, and influence of the community which first gave it currency something to do with this; or was it obtained on its intrinsic merits, plus the belief in its indirect derivation from Peter?

Judged from the point of view of a Clement of Rome, a "Second Clement," an Ignatius, a Polycarp, a Hermas, the intrinsic merits of a Gospel of Mark in comparison with others of the "many" *διηγήσεις* referred to by Luke cannot have been at all conspicuous. None of these writers, save possibly Hermas (and Hermas is from Rome), show special predilection for Mark. Both epistles ascribed to "Clement," as well as the seven of Ignatius, use uncanonical gospels more freely than they use Mark. Predilection, as soon as traceable in the Fathers,

is always in favor of Matthew, for reasons already set forth. Basilides and Marcion favor Luke. Their preference is equally explicable. Besides its larger content than Mark, Luke represents Antioch, or (North) "Syria and Cilicia," the native province of Basilides, and of Cerdon the teacher of Marcion as well.

The only other exception to the rule of second-century preference for Matthew is reported, and correctly accounted for as well, by Irenaeus. He tells us¹ that "Those who make a distinction between Jesus and Christ (i.e., Adoptionists or Docetists of the type represented in *Ev. Petri* and *Acta Joh.*), alleging that Christ remained impassible, but that it was Jesus who suffered, prefer the Gospel by Mark." This mere doctrinal preference has, of course, no bearing on our problem.

Mark is no more likely to have won popularity from the rhetorical and stylistic point of view than from that of contents or authorship. The innumerable corrections to Mark's Greek by both Matthew and Luke show plainly enough how his uncouth and barbarous idiom was regarded. Either, then, this primitive Gospel must have emanated from some centre of very great authority and importance, with or without the important sanction of an alleged derivation from Peter; or we are at a loss to account for the dominant position it acquired in every region of the early church to which our knowledge extends. Such an authoritative centre of emanation might be Rome; or it might equally well (so far as yet appears) be Jerusalem. Antioch might come next in consideration as a possibility; but Antioch, like Ephesus and Jerusalem, has a Gospel of its own, and yet (while using Mark, and in addition a large amount of "Petrine" material) makes no pretensions to any special relation to Peter. This would hardly be possible if the Antiochian church had previously employed the famous Markan "*Memorabilia* of Peter."

As we have seen, the only place besides Rome that raises a whisper of claim to the honor of being the birthplace of the Gospel is Alexandria, and that at a period so late (Chrysostom) and in a form so manifestly imitated from the Roman tradition

¹ Haer. iii. 11, 7.

which it aims to supersede, as to be immediately ruled out of court. As regards Jerusalem, whose claim might otherwise be regarded as strongest, the tradition of John the Elder is very damaging. For if ever there was a case of "damning with faint praise" it is here. And "the Elder" certainly speaks for Palestine.

To what extent, then, was the early dominance of Mark due to emanation from an authoritative centre, and to what extent to its alleged relation to Peter? In the attempt to answer this question it is important to recall the relation of priority already adverted to. The Gospel was not first known as ἀπομνημονεύματα Πέτρου and afterwards entitled κατὰ Μάρκον. It was first known simply as τὸ εὐαγγέλιον, later (to distinguish it from rivals) as τὸ κατὰ Μάρκον. Finally, to give it still greater authority, perhaps for wider circles, it was declared to embody recollections of the teaching or preaching of Peter. The reverse process is inconceivable.

If it were possible still to maintain the theory already described as that of the defenders of the authenticity of First Peter, representing the great Apostle of the circumcision as coming to Rome after Paul's death to become as it were administrator of his Gentile-church estate, in co-operation with his surviving fellow-workers, this would of course make the Roman provenance of Mark almost indisputable, confirming without more ado the tradition traceable to Papias. Unfortunately this tradition, as we have seen, cannot be traced any further back than Papias himself, and the more clearly it is seen to rest upon inference from 1 Peter 5, 13, the more dubious it becomes. The whole conception of Peter's ministry at Rome (I do not say, of his execution there) may be built out of this pseudonymous epistle. At all events, it lacks every element of support not derived from it. It also conflicts with Matthew, a gospel which beyond all others exalts the authority of Peter, making him the "Rock" on which the Church is founded and endowing him with authority to "bind and loose," while at the same time it surpasses all others in the strictness of its permanent limitation of the apostolic see to Jewish soil. Considerations of this type compel us to renounce a method of proof based on

Papias' exegesis of 1 Peter 5, 13. But what is the alternative? Grant that Peter never was in Rome; grant that the vague and allegorizing references of the Epistle to the "elect sister in Babylon," and to Mark as Peter's spiritual "son," are part of the author's literary *mise en scène*, grant that the commendation of Silvanus as "a faithful brother" and the gospel of the Pauline churches as "the true grace of God" are spoken in the name of "Peter" not because Peter was really present, but because his authority was indispensable to the object, we are still called upon to account for the immediate and undisputed acceptance of the inferences of Papias from this Epistle as to the provenance of a well known Gospel.

Papias' inference from 1 Peter 5, 13 would hardly have met such unopposed success, obtaining the assent even of Clement of Alexandria, if any other centre than Rome had at this time been putting forward claims to be the source of the Petrine teaching. Doubtless Antioch could boast many traditions of Peter; but so far as evangelic tradition was concerned, Antioch was already depending on another name, that of "Luke" the companion of Paul. Rome, not Antioch, was now (140-150 A.D.) aspiring to be known as "the see of Peter." Hence Papias' discovery in 1 Peter 5, 13 "met a long-felt want," precisely as did Eusebius' subsequent discovery in Papias' own pages of the much-desired "other John" in Asia, whom Dionysius of Alexandria had sought in vain, to be the author of the Revelation. At an earlier time, the period of Luke and Matthew, the "see of Peter" is Antioch or Jerusalem, as it had been since Paul described him as "the Apostle of the circumcision" and classed him with James the Lord's brother and John as one of the "pillars" at Jerusalem (Gal. 2, 7-9). Why, then, was it so desirable to bring Peter to Rome? If the (probably Roman) author of First Peter intends ἐν Βαβυλῶνι to be understood as Papias understood it, the motive is manifest. Himself a Roman, he would have the chief Apostle speak from Rome. This intention, however, is far from certain. With an equally emphatic "if" we may make the same assertion of John 21, 18, whose author employs First Peter, and is also probably Roman. If the Appendix to John is of Roman origin, ca. 150 A.D., as I

have argued in *The Fourth Gospel in Research and Debate*,¹ and if the phrase, "shall carry thee away whither thou wouldest not," is intended covertly to suggest Rome, we may still be dealing with ideas suggested by 1 Peter 5. But neither passage mentions Rome, or has anything to distinctly imply it. In these cases the ground is too uncertain; we base no inferences upon them. With Papias and those who adopted his account of Gospel origins the case is otherwise. There can be no mistaking the motive of his transforming comment upon "the Elder's" meagre testimony, when we compare it with the original. Papias is bent on making Mark simply the "translator" (*ἐρμηνευτής*) of the oral discourses of Peter, a "translator" who also transcribes upon the spot. By this means, the authority of the Gospel is enhanced to the very verge of direct apostolicity. "Mark, therefore made no error in writing down some things as he heard them; for he made it his one aim to omit nothing that he had heard, and to set down nothing amiss." Papias' motive in assuming Peter to be in Rome is to enhance the value of the Gospel he employs.

We come back, then, to the period antecedent to these attempted connections of Peter with Rome, a period when this Gospel was generally current, but known only by the name *κατὰ Μάρκον*. John of Jerusalem, it is true, vindicates a further claim commonly made on its behalf, that it contains authentic anecdotes of Peter. But its standing and currency were not originally gained on this representation. They were gained on the basis of the older tradition represented by its title. It had been "the Gospel according to Mark." We must look for its origin and its primary acceptance where such a title would suffice to give authority.

Considering first the possibility of a Palestinian provenance, it is self-evident that no gospel would be likely to attain currency and authoritative standing in the region of the apostolic mother church which could offer no better basis for its claims than the name of "Mark." To say nothing of the probability that in Palestine "John" was probably the designation of the individual in question (Acts 12, 25; 13, 5), and deferring the

¹ C. 7, "Epistles and Appendix."

question of language, no gospel having such small pretensions to apostolicity could have won in Palestine the place Mark came to occupy.

Attainment of it in Antioch, Alexandria, or Ephesus, under such a title would be less insupposable; but the very late and highly suspicious form of the tradition making the claim on behalf of Alexandria is strongly opposed to an Egyptian provenance, while Antioch and Ephesus have Gospels of their own, not mere revisions of Mark, though they make use of it. Tradition is absolutely silent as to provenance from these regions.

When we come to Rome, the conditions are precisely such as would favor the attainment of the standing achieved by Mark under the simple title *κατὰ Μάρκον*. The Pauline Epistles show John-Mark a trusted helper of Paul in Rome when the curtain falls on the great Apostle's activity. Rome, and Rome alone, has anything to relate of personal connection with this individual that may be based on actual knowledge. Hippolytus¹ at Rome calls Mark *ὁ κολυβοδάκτυλος*. What the meaning of the epithet may be we cannot say, declining to add new romances to the fanciful interpretations of medieval and later legend makers. But the mere currency of the epithet proves that early in the third century Rome still had something of its own to tell concerning John-Mark. No other region tells anything not found in Acts save the unimportant claim of Alexandria, and a real sojourn of Mark in Alexandria in 50-60 is quite admissible.

But after the period of the later Pauline Epistles an epoch is begun by a new characterization of our evangelist. In 85-90 A.D. Mark appears again in 1 Peter 5, 13. It is not certain that Mark is here regarded as resident in Rome, it is not even certain that he was still living; but it is important to observe that in this probably Roman writing his chief claim to distinction has come to be the fact that he had been a (spiritual) "son" of Peter, no mention being made of his relations to Barnabas and Paul. This corresponds to the rapidly growing reverence of the sub-apostolic age for "eye-witnesses and ministers of the word," a word of divine revelation which had been "first spoken by the

¹ Refut. vii. 30.

Lord" and afterward confirmed to it "by them that heard."¹ The epithet "my son" explains how (at Rome?) a Gospel could attain to superlative authority on the simple assurance that it was "According to Mark." In other domains than evangelic story the name of Mark was probably not one to conjure with. But Mark had once been an associate of Peter. As time went by such a distinction rapidly increased in value. In Hebrews (ca. 85) those who had "heard" the revelation and seen the "signs and wonders" are already reckoned to a past generation. Anecdotes of the "sayings and doings of the Lord" put forth under the name and sanction of Mark would soon attain locally all the authority of direct narrations of Peter himself. At the same time resort to secondary authority in support of the Gospel argues strongly against ability to appeal to primary. Wherever Mark obtained its title it is practically certain the local church was not as yet able to say: This is the Gospel we received from Peter himself.

Outside its place of origin a Gospel having the reputed sanction of the chief Apostle would have free course to be glorified. Once current in the Greek-speaking church as ἀπομνημονεύματα Πέτρου no other compend could hope to rival it until one should appear bearing the name of an Apostle and supposedly representing the church of "the Apostles and Elders" in Jerusalem. But for years after Mark appeared the mother church in Jerusalem still manifests the well known Jewish preference for oral tradition, perhaps appreciating the principle of which Rome later made ample use, that published teaching is anybody's or nobody's property, the tool of friend and foe alike. Contrariwise, the unpublished "tradition of the fathers," handed down by word of mouth, and limited to the initiate, is an almost impregnable bulwark of orthodoxy. Synagogue rule allowed the targumist liberty to draw up written notes of the translation and interpretation of the sacred text for his own private use at home; and doubtless the Aramaic basis of our earliest Greek Gospel must be referred to such written διηγήσεις, gradually extended in compass. Officially, however, the "church of the Apostles and Elders in Jerusalem" will have stood for "the

¹ Luke 1, 2; Heb. 2, 3.

living and abiding voice " as of " more profit than books." The result was that the first widely circulated Gospels, properly so-called, were Greek; though they rest on a Semitic foundation. The Aramaic compositions of which we have actual knowledge through surviving fragments and reports by the Fathers are without exception later than the Greek and based upon them. These pseudo-apostolic, second-century Aramaic gospels represent the belated and fruitless attempt of the Oriental church to undo the ill effects of its earlier conservatism.

The preference of the Aramaic-speaking mother-church in Jerusalem for oral tradition, combined with its exalted sense of its own commission as custodian and interpreter of the true gospel of Jesus, is the true explanation of the curious anomaly that the oldest extant Gospels are Greek writings, though based from the necessities of the case on Aramaic material. It also explains that other curious phenomenon with which we are now engaged, that by the unanimous testimony of ancient tradition, corroborated (as we shall see) by the internal evidence, the primitive Church turned not to the East, and to Palestinian contemporary records, for its standard story of the life and teaching of Jesus, but to a Greek writing of the remotest branch of the Church, a writing which did not even claim to be by an Apostle, but was admittedly composed under circumstances which made the testimony of the eye-witnesses inaccessible to the evangelist!

At first sight this anomaly would seem almost incredible. In reality it is precisely what close knowledge of the conditions should lead us to expect. Remote and self-confident Rome under its Pauline leaders¹ need have no hesitation in putting to any use it chose such traditions and records of Jesus' life and teaching as its archives afforded. Few, at this remove of time and distance, would dispute the statements advanced. A large and fast growing body of Gentile Christians would welcome the work, support its claims (such as they might be) to apostolic authenticity, and maintain its authority. Contrariwise, the nearer we approach to Jerusalem with its body

¹ On the Paulinism of the Roman church in Paul's day, and for some decades after, see below.

of eye-witnesses, jealous to an extreme degree of their claim to hold the true tradition of the Lord's career and teaching, yet at the same time refusing to put it in writing, the more difficult does it become for any non-apostolic record (and the claims of the Second Source on this score must have been even less than Mark's, from the treatment accorded to its order by Matthew and Luke) to obtain currency and standing.

Of all possible quarters from which to expect early and wide dissemination of such a gospel as Mark, Rome is by all odds the most probable. That this earliest of extant Greek Gospels should attain its short-lived supremacy under the simple title "According to Mark" is explicable under the theory of Roman provenance, but hardly otherwise. By virtue of its claim to represent the teaching of Peter, whose spiritual "son" Mark had been, and no less by virtue of the refusal on the part of the "successors of the Apostles" (*διάδοχοι τῶν ἀποστόλων*) at Jerusalem, who regarded themselves as trustees and guardians of the "commandments delivered by the Lord," to publish their deposit of the faith in written form, this Gospel attained that pre-eminence in the field which produced the phenomenon known to modern criticism as "Synoptic" tradition. Deep below the surface it laid the foundation for the see of Peter at Rome. For Matthew and Luke, Jerusalem (with Antioch as a daughter see) is still the seat of "Petrine" authority. For Matthew the very Church of Christ is founded on this "Rock." Authority to "bind and loose" is vested in him, and under his leadership the Church wins its victory over the powers of the underworld. Even when "the Holy City" has been laid waste, Matthew cannot conceive the departure of the apostolic see from one of "the cities of Israel" till the Son of Man be come. However, this transfer, so unimaginable to Matthew, is ultimately accomplished by purely literary means. The Gospel of Mark effected it; for the more concerned men were to prove that this Gospel comprised the preaching of Peter, the more easily persuaded were they that the church which had given it out had listened to the Apostle himself. Thus Peter's emigrant spiritual "son" provides his venerable father with a new home in the West. Rome gave to the Christian world under the

name of "Peter's Memoirs" that written record of the "sayings and doings of the Lord" which it craved, and which Jerusalem had refused. The Christian world gave to Rome in return that "power of the keys" which Jerusalem had intended for itself.

III. THE INTERNAL EVIDENCE

A. LANGUAGE

NEITHER the evidence of tradition nor of dissemination can be decisive of the question of provenance if unsupported by the internal evidence. In the case of Mark modern criticism finds many data to corroborate the results already attained. Those which are naturally first to be considered are those of language.

The Gospel is written in Greek, the language employed by Paul in writing to the Roman church in 55 A.D., and employed by its own great writers throughout the century following, Clement, Hermas, Justin. This represents only the transparent *prima facie* fact. Much more deeply significant is the phenomenon of the Bible quotations, which are made from the Septuagint.¹ We have, indeed, one instance of a quotation borrowed from the Second Source (Mark 1, 2; cf. Matt. 11, 10 = Luke 7, 27), one whose origin Redactor Marci did not recognize, erroneously ascribing it to "Isaiah," and two other cases of Old Testament language reflecting the Hebrew rather than the Septuagint text, which are probably due to the same cause. These exceptions are of the type which "prove the rule." Habitually the evangelist uses the Septuagint and is affected by it in his style and vocabulary. As a rule his references are memoriter, and less pains are taken than in Matthew's transcription to make the wording agree exactly with the Septuagint text. All the more certain is it that the Bible used by this evangelist and the circle for whom he wrote was the Greek Bible.

¹ The phenomena of the Scripture employments and quotations of Mark belong properly to another phase of the problem. It may be stated that the necessarily brief account here attempted rests upon independent personal study of all the passages. The general result had been stated by other investigators. Mark uses, and is influenced by, the LXX. He does not use, nor is he directly influenced by, the Hebrew. Quotations which seem to show such influence are 1, 2, of which mention is made above, and 15, 34 = Psalm 22, 1 (Heb.). In addition 4, 29 shows influence from Joel 4, 13. The possible tinge from the Hebrew in this case should be accounted for as in that of 1, 2, viz., derivation from the Second Source. On 15, 34 = Psalm 22, 1, see below.

These outstanding phenomena of the Gospel of Mark already prove that in its present form it was put first in circulation among the Greek-speaking churches north and west of the Taurus range, rather than in Syria; but they do not exclude the possibility of translation, whether of the work as a whole, or of the material underlying it.

1. In point of fact the Greek of Mark is so unmistakably tintured by a Semitic basis as to make it practically certain, in the judgment of competent scholars such as Wellhausen and Torrey, that the material is largely translated from a written Aramaic document, or documents. But the most convincing proof of translation would carry no weight against Roman provenance unless it could be shown to involve the Gospel as a whole, editorial building as well as basic material. No exception, therefore, need be taken by advocates of the view for which we are here contending to the idea that the Gospel of Mark consists largely, perhaps almost exclusively, of Aramaic documentary material, preserved in the archives of the church in Rome; for such material must have been carried everywhere from Palestine by primitive evangelists. More or less stereotyped oral tradition would soon give place to written anecdotes and memoranda; for even the synagogue translator was permitted to put his targums in written form for private use and elaboration, though forbidden to bring such documents into the pulpit. Aramaic notes and memoranda of this sort in homiletic form would certainly be preserved and translated at Rome; for in Rome, as elsewhere, the earliest church-teachers were necessarily converted Jews. Such as had most to tell of gospel story would naturally be those from Palestine.

For reasons based on the internal structure of the Gospel of Mark, particularly evidences of its dependence to a limited extent upon the Second Source, it is more probable that an intermediate stage of preliminary translation and agglutination lies between the Gospel in its present form and certain earlier groupings of preacher's anecdotes of the kind described, corresponding to Jewish religious story. For its ultimate data nothing less than the entire historical content of the Gospel

must of course go back to that Aramaic which it so freely quotes, and with such manifest satisfaction.

The advocate of Roman provenance may, therefore, welcome proofs almost *ad libitum* that the Greek of Mark is "translation Greek." Its own compiler, he who introduces in transliteration, wherever the narrative furnishes good excuse, the actual Aramaic words used by Jesus, would be the first to take pride in the fact. So would the original sponsors for the Gospel, those readers for whose benefit the Aramaic words are introduced. They would undoubtedly claim that the Aramaic material translated had belonged to John-Mark the "son" of Peter; and as regards some of the most important historical elements their claim would probably have real basis in fact. All this, however serviceable and interesting, a contribution of real importance from the side of grammatical philology, has no bearing against the fact that the Gospel as we know it, and as it was known to the remotest attainable antiquity, was and is a Greek document, compiled and annotated for a Greek-speaking community. This community, like the evangelist himself, recognized and used not the Hebrew but the Greek Old Testament, and was ignorant, to a considerably greater degree than those addressed by Matthew and Luke, not only of the Jewish language, but (as we shall see) of its customs, conditions, institutions, politics, history, geography, and environment.

The mass of Mark may very well prove to be "translation Greek." Its Greek is at all events cruder and more uncouth than that of either Matthew or Luke; for both our later Synop- tists make hundreds of grammatical and stylistic corrections of the Greek of Mark, even while at the same time in their own translated material (and sometimes on their own account) they retain, almost ostentatiously, certain favorite Semitisms of "biblical" type which are avoided by Mark.

It would perhaps be possible to explain this curious anomaly by supposing that between the publication of Mark and its later satellites "translation Greek" had been raised to the standing of a literary fashion, the example of the Septuagint giving currency in ecclesiastical circles to certain favorite "biblicisms" not as yet in vogue when Mark was written. A more

probable explanation is to be found in the vastly greater use of the Second Source made by Matthew and Luke than by Mark.

The material independently employed by Matthew and Luke which does not appear in Mark is commonly designated Q, and is derived from a Second Source, which when employed by them was (like Mark) in the form of a Greek document translated from the Aramaic. Both in its original and its translated form this Second Source was a document of far higher literary pretensions, and in much more artistic style, than Mark. Its Greek is also "translation Greek," but of a type more free than Mark's from crude solecisms, while highly affected by the author's fondness for Septuagint phraseology. Matthew and Luke sacrifice its order to the Markan, and probably suppress, or at least subordinate, most of its narrative — a course hardly compatible with belief in its Apostolic authorship. They use it for its teaching material, and are demonstrably influenced by its literary superiority. Now Q delights in "biblicisms," as the modern school-boy delights to compose in "King James" English by frequent interlardings of "and behold," or "and it came to pass." If, then, the "translation Greek" of Matthew and Luke displays the same difference from that of Mark, using "biblicisms" even in some cases where we have no reason to believe they are directly incorporating the Second Source, this is no more than we should expect from the far greater consideration they show for its language.

Familiar examples of such "biblicisms" are the endless cases of *καὶ ἐγένετο* (an Old Testament idiom whose Aramaic equivalent is doubtful) in Luke, their monotony only partly relieved by variation. These are almost always avoided by Mark. Matthew also avoids them; but with a curious exception. For his five-fold colophon, closing each of his five great "Sermons," Matthew stereotypes the formula found at the close of the first ¹ in Q (Matt. 7, 28 = Luke 7, 1, β text) *καὶ ἐγένετο ὅτε ἐτέλεσεν κ.τ.λ.* One other case occurs in Markan material (Matt. 9, 10), where Matthew overlooks the correction of this biblicism so willingly

¹ This Discourse on the Righteousness of Sons (corresponding to the so-called Sermon on the Mount) is the only one derived as a whole from the Second Source. The other four are based on Mark.

and copiously admitted by Luke. Elsewhere he prefers more idiomatic Greek connection.

The biblicism *καὶ ἰδοὺ* (= Heb. וְהִנֵּה, Aram. וְהִרִי) is freely employed by both later evangelists, though excluded by Mark (cf. Mark 1, 40; 5, 22, with parallels). On the other hand the connection by *τότε*, especially in the phrase *τότε ὁ Ἰησοῦς*, seems to be a mannerism of Matthew. Other instances will doubtless appear in the special study to be devoted to this aspect of our problem. The explanation here proposed may not be the true one. If not, the grammarians must furnish a better. Meantime it may suffice to note the following difference between the Semitic tincture of Mark and that of the two later Synoptists: the "translation Greek" of Mark seems to be naïvely and crudely Semitic; whereas that of Matthew and Luke has been reduced to a literary type of its own, with Septuagint Greek for a model. Zahn well expresses the general nature of the phenomena in his Introduction (§ 53, English translation, II, 487):

Mark reproduces in his Greek book with apparent pleasure the Aramaic form of Jesus' words and those of other persons, although it is always necessary to append a Greek translation for the benefit of his readers. (This is not always the case in either Matthew, Luke, or John). . . . It is also to be noticed that Mark's Greek shows Hebraic colouring more strongly than any other of the Gospels and almost beyond that of any other New Testament writing. Although Mark does not exhibit as many flagrant errors against grammar, conscious or unintentional, as does the Book of Revelation, he has more genuine Semitic idioms.

We may leave to the philological specialists particularly concerned with this aspect of the problem the question whether the difference thus noted can be accounted for by the influence of the Second Source. Meantime it is needless to transcribe the details of evidence appended by Zahn (I, 502) to his general statement. Careful statistics are furnished by Wernle, Hawkins, and Stanton. In particular, Swete, after a characteristically thorough and careful study of Blass' theory of an Aramaic original for Mark, reaches the following conclusion:

An examination of St. Mark's vocabulary and style reveals peculiarities of diction and colouring which cannot reasonably be explained in this way. Doubtless there is a sense in which the book is based upon Aramaic originals; it is in the main a reproduction of Aramaic teaching, behind which there probably lay oral or written sources, also Aramaic. But the Greek Gospel

is manifestly not a mere translation of an Aramaic work. It bears on every page marks of the individuality of the author. If he wrote in Aramaic, he translated his book into Greek, and the translation which we possess is his own. But such a conjecture is unnecessary, as well as at variance with the witness of Papias.¹

To disprove the theory of Roman provenance it is not enough to show evidence for the "Aramaic originals" referred to by this eminent authority, either as respects the "Aramaic teaching" which it reproduces, or the "oral and written sources, also Aramaic" which "lay behind" this. Such material was doubtless available in the archives of the Roman church after the death of Peter, and indeed of Mark as well. To disprove the origin of Mark at Rome it would be needful to show not only that the material shows marks of translation (whether before the work of compilation, or by the evangelist himself as part of his undertaking), but that the Gospel as such, inclusive of the editorial framework, was current in Aramaic. Considering the necessity every editor is under of adapting his own language more or less to that of the material he edits, it is safe to regard this feat as beyond the grammarian's powers. Curious indeed would be the paradox if ecclesiastical tradition had so long cherished the mistaken belief that the first Gospel is a translated work, while erroneously maintaining the contrary belief regarding the second.

2. From the Aramaic coloration of Mark's Greek we may turn to the well-known phenomenon of this evangelist's large use of Latinisms. As the case is often overstated, we prefer to present it in the cautious and well chosen language of Zahn:

The fact that Mark uses more Latin technical terms than the other evangelists has only comparative value, since such words were in common use everywhere in the provinces, even among the Jews in Palestine. The use of such terms instead of the Greek expressions indicates difference of taste, not the author's nationality. Still it must have been very natural for an author writing in Rome for Romans to employ Latin names for Latin things.

Of these Latinisms a striking example is *κεντυρίων* Mark 15, 39, 44, 45; in the parallel passages of Matthew and Luke, and everywhere else in the New Testament, we have only *ἐκατόν-*

¹ Op. cit., p. xlii.

ταρχος or ἑκατοντάρχης (Matthew, four times, Luke, three times, Acts, fourteen times). Other instances of Latinisms found only in Mark among New Testament writers (though occasionally employed elsewhere) are σπεκουλάτωρ (6, 27) and ξέστης (7, 4, 8) = *sextarius*. Mark also uses φραγελλοῦν = *flagellare*, and κῆνσος (for which Luke in 20, 22 prefers the Greek φόρος). We also find κοδράντης (= *quadrans*) in 12, 42, and πραιτώριον in 15, 16. All these expressions had passed over into the current speech of Jews throughout the empire, so that their mere occurrence in Mark cannot prove anything as to its origin in a Latin-speaking region. Even their greater proportion in Mark is merely suggestive. But Zahn does not hesitate to call it "decisive" that in two instances Mark "explains Greek by Latin." The two examples of this, the explanation of αὐλή by πραιτώριον, in 15, 16, and of λεπτό δυνά by κοδράντης in 12, 42, will be discussed presently.

Swete¹ tells us, apropos of συμβούλιον ποιήσαντες = Vg. *consilium facientes* in 15, 1, that "the late and rare word συμβούλιον was used as a technical term to represent the Latin *consilium*." The word is certainly "late and rare" and may be (as Mommsen avers) "formed in the Graeco-Latin official style to represent the untranslatable *consilium*." But this hardly distinguishes it from the other Latinisms. Matthew uses συμβούλιον λαμβάνειν, whose precise equivalent in English is "take counsel," but only in passages which are probably influenced by Mark. We may leave to others the question whether συμβούλιον διδόναι (3, 6 = *edere*?), φαίνεται (14, 64 = *videtur*?), ῥάπισμασιν αὐτὸν ἔλαβον (14, 65 = *verberibus eum acceperunt*?), ἐπιβαλὼν (? 14, 72), and ποιῆσαι τὸ ἱκανόν (15, 15 = *satisfacere*?) are properly to be reckoned as Latinisms, and if so what bearing they have on the provenance of Mark. It will be more serviceable if at this point we turn from evidences purely grammatical and linguistic to evidences of a more general type, beginning with the explanations offered by the evangelist to his readers of things Jewish, Palestinian, or Oriental. Under this head must be included not only the valuation of the com-

¹ Commentary, on Mark 15, 1. The authority on which Swete rests is Mommsen as cited by Deissmann, *Bible Studies*, p. 238.

mon Greek coin, the λεπτόν in 12, 42, and the attachment in 15, 16 to the common Greek term αὐλή, meaning "court," of the Latin πραιτώριον, but several dubious explanations of Aramaic words and phrases.

B. EDITORIAL GLOSSES AND EXPLANATIONS

It is noticeable that in Mark we have explanations to the reader of things Jewish and Oriental. These usually take the form of parenthetical notes, obiter dicta, or of glosses superficially attached. These last may be termed "editorial," because they appear (so far as textual evidence avails) to be an authentic part of the original work. We have observed (with Zahn) that Red.-Marc. reproduces "with apparent pleasure" the Aramaic words of Jesus on great occasions such as the raising of Jairus' daughter (5, 41), the healing of the deaf-mute (7, 34), the prayer in Gethsemane (14, 36), and the parting cry from the cross (15, 34). This in itself would carry small weight, were it not that, unlike other evangelists who make less display of their linguistic attainments, Mark seems to consider an accompanying translation necessary for his readers' benefit in all cases save the most commonplace.¹ Even "abba" (14, 36) he finds it needful to translate as ὁ πατήρ (with Paul, Rom. 8, 15; Gal. 4, 6); while Matthew and Luke are content with the simple Greek equivalent, omitting the Aramaic (Matthew 26, 39 = Luke 22, 42; cf. Matthew 6, 9 = Luke 11, 2). How pedantic it would have sounded in Jerusalem or Antioch to translate *abba*!

It might be "decisive," as Zahn maintains, and at the same time more definite geographically, were it the fact that Mark

explains Greek by Latin: 12, 42, λεπτὰ δύο, ὃ ἐστὶν κοδράντης; and 15, 16, ἔσω τῆς αὐλῆς, ὃ ἐστὶν πραιτώριον. . . . The discussions between Blass and Ramsay (*Expository Times*, X, 232, 287, 336) have only made it evident that it could not possibly occur to one who was writing for Greeks to explain the common expression δύο λεπτὰ by the word κοδράντης — a word to them much less familiar, to say the least. This is just the situation in Mark 15, 16. To support his assertion — which has no support whatever in the tradition —

¹ Only the Ephesian evangelist finds it necessary to translate ῥαββί and ῥαββουνί (John 1, 38: 20, 16), "the Messiah" (1, 41), and significant proper names such as Siloam (9, 7), Gabbatha (19, 13), Golgotha (19, 17). Luke often uses νομοδιδάσκαλος instead of γραμματεὺς, and ἀληθῶς for "amen."

that Mark is a translation of an Aramaic book, Blass (*loc. cit.*) says that ὁ ἐστὶν πραιτώριον is a mistranslation of αὐλή, which there denotes not palace, but courtyard. The word has the latter meaning only in 14, 66.

But Professor George F. Moore cites exactly the same equation of coinage, 1 quadrans (κοδράντης) = 2 perutas (λεπτά), from a Palestinian Hebrew text of the second century;¹ and ὁ ἐστὶν πραιτώριον need not be a "mistranslation" of the comprehensive αὐλή; it may merely serve for closer determination. Altogether the term *indecisive* would seem more suitable for these linguistic evidences.

The weak point of Zahn's argument appears when he is called upon as champion of the traditional authorship to defend the correctness of Red.-Marc. explanations. Thus the rendering υἱοὶ βροντῆς for the mysterious title βοανηργές applied to the sons of Zebedee in 3, 17, is still an unexplained puzzle. Neither ancient nor modern philology furnishes a real Aramaic equivalent.² Again in the (more authentic) scene of the trial before Pilate (15, 1-5) the expression σὺ λέγεις is correctly understood as noncommittal. As the late Prof. J. H. Thayer has shown (*Journal of Biblical Literature*, XIII, 40-49) this phrase appears in Jewish writings in the sense, "So you say." In the (imitated) scene of 14, 61-65, the evangelist apparently takes it as a positive affirmation.

The suspicion that Red.-Marc., while able to translate Aramaic for his readers' benefit, has no such mastery of the language as we must presuppose in a native or long resident of Jerusalem, is strengthened when we read the attempt in 15, 34-36, to interpret the parting "loud cry" of Jesus as a quotation of Psalm 22, 1. So extreme a representation of the mental agony of Jesus could not fail to evoke protest, and it is therefore quite intelligible that Luke should substitute the more acceptable Psalm 31, 5 ("Into thy hands I commit my spirit"). Both,

¹ The Baraitha on the coinage, Jer. Kidd. ed. Ven. f. 58 d, l. 25 ff., ed. Zitom. Kidd. f. 3 b near bottom; see also Krauss, *Talmudische Archäologie*, II, 409, 674. This information forms one of a series of invaluable criticisms and suggestions for which the author desires to express his obligation to Professor Moore.

² On "Dalmanutha" (Mark 8, 10), A. Wright in his *Synopticon* remarks, "No satisfactory explanation of the word has been found." He commends that suggested by Rendel Harris (*Study of Codex Bezae*, p. 178) which makes it a misrendering of the Aramaic.

however, appear to be attempts to fill out with meaning the too bald statement of verse 37 that "Jesus expired with a loud cry." But in Mark this still stands (in spite of the duplication) alongside of verse 34. The Markan and Lukan Scripture quotations, therefore, are secondary and tertiary developments respectively. What Luke thinks of the Markan elaboration upon Psalm 22, 1, may be judged by his substitute in 23, 36-37. For Mark 15, 34-36, in which the incident of the cry is combined with that of the offering of vinegar (retained alone in John 19, 28), is full of difficulties. If it be one of the soldiers who offers the drink of posca, as commonly understood, how does the soldier come to be familiar with the Jewish belief in the coming of Elias? We may suppose him a local recruit familiar both with the language and the prophesied coming of Elias. But in that case how could he mistake the Aramaic words quoted as a call to Elias? The simplest escape is by supposing the quotation to have been made in Hebrew, which would give, in fact, Eli, Eli, lamah 'azabtani (אֵלִי אֵלִי לָמָּה עֲזַבְתָּנִי), the first two words being mistakable by persons unfamiliar with Hebrew, but familiar (like the Aramaic speaking populace, and perhaps members of the locally recruited guard) with the legend of the coming of Elias. The Aramaic אֵלִי אֵלִי could hardly be mistaken for the prophet's name. The supposition that the utterance was made in Hebrew is therefore the natural resort of the β text which frankly substitutes $\zeta\alpha\phi\theta\alpha\nu\epsilon\iota$ (Dd) $\zeta\alpha\beta\alpha\phi\theta\alpha\nu\epsilon\iota$ (or $\zeta\alpha\beta\alpha\chi\theta\alpha\nu\epsilon\iota$?) (B, τ i), or $zaphani$ (k) for the authentic Aramaic $\sigma\alpha\beta\alpha\kappa\tau\alpha\nu\epsilon\iota$. In fact in the β text Matthew also has Ἠλὲ , though the rest of the quotation is given in Aramaic. Evang. Petri, rendering the cry $\eta\ \delta\upsilon\nu\alpha\mu\acute{\iota}\varsigma\ \mu\omicron\nu$, $\eta\ \delta\upsilon\nu\alpha\mu\acute{\iota}\varsigma$, also clearly presupposes the Hebrew. There is, accordingly, strong evidence that the original author of this explanation of the cry, which in the present form of the Gospel has made its way into the text, assumed that Jesus quoted the Psalm in Hebrew. The compiler of the Gospel as it now stands, Red.-Marc., considers, on the contrary, that here, as elsewhere, Jesus spoke in Aramaic. He therefore, gives the quotation in Aramaic, but not in such Aramaic as would be written were the story original with one familiar with this language. The two peculiarities which remain for expla-

nation are the following: (a) Here, as in two other cases of probably borrowed material (Mark 1, 2; 4, 29), but more unmistakably, the Hebrew text makes itself felt in the form of the quotation.¹ (b) The Aramaic itself is faulty, transliterating לְמָה שֶׁבִּקְרָמִי אֵלֶּהי אֵלֶּהי as ἐλωὶ ἐλωὶ λαμὰ σαβαχθανεὶ according to Nestle's text. Even if we exonerate Red.-Marc. at the cost of transcribers, the errors must not only go back of all known witnesses to the text, but (at least in part) even back of Matthew's transcription. We must either construct a text out of whole cloth or hold Red.-Marc. responsible. If the evangelist himself wrote such Aramaic as this, the fact has a bearing on the question where Mark first circulated.

In Mark 7, 3-4 we have a further example of the evangelist's explanation of Jewish terms and practices. Montefiore and Abrahams indignantly repudiate as libellous this description of Jewish distinctions of "clean" and "unclean," and to this attitude of Red.-Marc. toward things Jewish as a pervasive feature of the Gospel we must return later. Meantime apropos of the expression κοινὰς χερσὶν of the source (verse 5 forms part of the material) we can but ask: How could any but readers remote from Palestine and Jewish customs require an explanation of the word κοινός employed in the technical sense? Not even Paul (Rom. 14, 14), or the author of Hebrews (2, 14; 9, 10, 29), finds it necessary to explain the terms κοινός, κοινούν, and the author of Rev. 21, 27 finds explanation equally needless. Luke, it is true, adds the synonym ἀκάθαρτος in Acts 10, 14; 15, 28, and 11, 8, 9; but Matthew in his parallel to Mark 7, 1-5 simply omits the entire explanatory digression, employing the term κοινούν in 15, 11, 18, 20, as if the meaning were self-evident. Red.-Marc., we observe, not only finds explanation needful for his readers, but shows at least lack of sympathy for things Jewish, if not alien ignorance, in the explanation he undertakes to furnish. In his introductory paragraph (7, 1-2) he first repeats with the explanatory gloss: κοινὰς, τοῦτ' ἔστιν ἀνίπτους, the statement of his source (ver. 5), that "The Pharisees and scribes asked him, Why do thy disciples not walk

¹ See Dittmar, *Vetus Testamentum in Novo*, 103,9 ad loc. The LXX has ὁ θεός, ὁ θεός μου, πρόσχες μοι, ἵνα τί ἐγκατέλιπές με.

according to the tradition of the elders, but eat their bread with common (*κοινᾷς*) hands? "; thereafter he interjects a description of Jewish observances (vers. 3-4), whose tone can hardly be called respectful, even if "ablutions of cups and pots" do form part of Jewish ritual. Even when the sense is expressed by the Greek itself, as in *παρασκευή* (15, 42), Mark appends a paraphrase (*ὁ ἐστὶν προσάβατον*), and explains the sense of the transliterated *γέεννα* (9, 43, *τὸ πῦρ τὸ ἄσβεστον*).

C. LOCAL GEOGRAPHY AND HISTORY

1. Explanations of Palestinian climate and geography are particularly significant of the location of the readers in East or West. Thus Mark 11, 13, *ὁ γὰρ καιρὸς οὐκ ἦν σύκων* invites our notice by the fact that the evangelist finds it needful to explain to his readers that Passover was "not the season of figs." Such information regarding the climate of Jerusalem might be required at Rome. It certainly could not be on any of the eastern coasts of the Mediterranean.

Other editorial explanations indicate not only such ignorance on the readers' part as is hardly to be imagined in Oriental circles, and not paralleled in Matthew or Luke, but also a condition of the evangelist's own mind, neither wholly well-informed nor sympathetic. It is inevitable from the beginning already made to push the enquiry beyond explanatory glosses, and seek in the body of the work for further indications of the geographical standpoint.

2. The great discourse on the Doom of Jerusalem (Mark 13), reproduced with some Q expansions in Matthew 24 and Luke 21, is a striking feature of the Gospel,¹ constructed, as the present writer has endeavored to prove,² on the basis of Q logia with special reference to the events of 67-70 A.D. (and hence later than 70), using the visions of Daniel to weld the whole into a typical apocalyptic eschatology. The author's prin-

¹ The only other long discourse of Mark is the chapter of parables. This also in the interpretation of Red.-Marc. is a preaching of judgment against the people of deaf ears. As Swete points out (Commentary, p. 74), the other long discourses of Mark are "delivered privately to the Twelve."

² Journal of Biblical Literature, XXVIII (1909), pp. 1-25.

cial effort, however, is to restrain rather than foment eschatological fervor, and for this purpose he not only shapes his compilation along the lines of the Pauline (or Deutero-Pauline?) eschatology of 2 Thess. 2, but even borrows its peculiar watch-word *μὴ θροεῖσθε* as the chief burden of his exhortation. This reassuring appeal, "be not wrought up," sounds the keynote of Red.-Marc., warning against the plausible deceivers who proclaim the second coming of Christ, even in many cases declaring, "I am He," and showing deceptive signs and wonders. In the spirit (and to some extent the language) of 2 Thess. 2, 1-12 the readers are warned against the Antichrist and his false prophets, and bidden to refuse assent to their efforts at agitation, whether (1) on the ground of general catastrophes in various places (13, 3-8), or (2) more specifically on the ground of the visitation of Judea and Jerusalem with the desolation predicted by Daniel (verses 14-23).

The fact that such detailed prediction of the fate of Jerusalem with specific application of the Danielic visions does not elsewhere appear in the authentic teaching of Jesus need not here detain us. It may or may not support the much favored theory of an eschatological Flugblatt incorporated by the evangelist. We will not even dwell upon the fact (significantly paralleled as it is by other quasi-Pauline phenomena of Mark) that the Antichrist legend finds its roots (so far as non-Markan material is concerned) not in any authentic teaching of Jesus, but only in Revelation and the Pauline (or possibly Deutero-Pauline) tract known as Second Thessalonians. Let the historical authenticity of all the predictions of Mark 13, 14-20, describing the horrors of the Jewish war, be fully granted, despite the contrast they present to the more general moral warnings of Luke 12, 42-13, 9, and to Jesus' deprecation of attempts to prognosticate in the Q logion (Matthew 24, 25 ff. = Luke 17, 21 ff.), still it will not be easy to explain how a writer not himself an outsider should speak of these calamities as falling on "those that are in Judea" (Mark 13, 14). In comparison with this peculiarity it is of very small significance that Matthew, who is generally acknowledged to write from the Palestinian standpoint, should insert the word *εὐθὺς* at the

beginning of the third and closing paragraph. For Matthew's aim is to increase faith in the particular eschatology which he takes over from Mark (in an interpretation of his own), rather than to hold in check, as does Q (and to a less extent Mark), the tendency to apocalyptic superstition. Mark, however, writes of the desolation as something which happens to "those in Judea." Not even this special visitation must mislead the church. Only when "the powers that are in the heavens are shaken" (verse 25) can the Coming be expected; for was it not an essential part of the eschatology of Paul, not only that the times of the Gentiles must be fulfilled (Rom. 9-11; cf. Mark 13, 10), but also (Eph. 6, 12) that the real struggle is "not against flesh and blood, but against the principalities and powers in the heavenly regions"?

That Matthew and Luke have taken over this doom chapter of Mark (13) is almost a matter of course. At their time of writing no other course would be conceivable. But this should not blind us to the fact that whatever the source of the materials, the construction is a composition of the second evangelist's own. The question for us to ask, then, is whether the use here made of Q logia and apocalyptic legend is such as we should expect from a converted Jew of Rome. We shall return later to the question of the "Paulinism" of Mark, which cannot be wholly disregarded in an enquiry as to provenance. Meantime we take note as a geographic indication of some value that the evangelist speaks of the events of A.D. 67-70 as calling for the flight of "those in Judea" to "the mountains."

3. The impression made by the reference to the flight of "those in Judea" is confirmed by the "meagreness" of geographical data, and the "reticence" of the evangelist in regard to "the complex political life which prevailed in Palestine at the time," which are noted by Swete, but which the commentator feels sure are "not due to ignorance."¹

Our own knowledge is unfortunately so small as to restrict to narrowest limits the possibility of argument on this score. We find, for example, reference in Mark 8, 10 to a landing on the west (?) shore of the Lake of Galilee at a place denominated

¹ Op. cit., pp. lxxxii, lxxxv.

Dalmanutha. The name is otherwise unknown, and was as much a puzzle to ancient as to modern geographers. Matthew changes to Magadan (= Magdala? Mageda?), the β text has *Μελεγαδά*, or *Μαγαιδά*. Arthur Wright in his Greek Synopsis notes the simple fact that "no satisfactory explanation of the word Dalmanutha has been found." He commends the suggestion of Rendel Harris that *דלמנותרא* is a clerical error of an early scribe, *ר* being the preposition "of," *ל* the preposition "to" and *מנותרא* meaning "the parts"; so that the whole sentence runs: "He came into the parts of—into the parts." Here, whatever the fact, the ignorance will be charged not to author or transcriber but to the critic, unable, as he is, from the nature of the case, to prove the non-existence of a place so named. Even were it possible to establish this "universal negative," the evangelist personally would still escape. It would be said (as actually by Rendel Harris) that the misunderstanding by which an Aramaic phrase has been taken for a proper name is a "clerical error of an early scribe."

Similar difficulties would beset any attempt by the critic to show geographical error in Mark 11, 1, where the earliest text of Mark gives "Bethphage and Bethany," but Matthew has *εἰς Βηθφαγή*. Bethphage ("home of figs") is in fact a village on the Mount of Olives known to the Talmud and to Eusebius,¹ and is suitable to the context, which goes on to refer to "the village (sing.) over against you." No "Bethany" is traceable in this locality except as derived from Mark. The true solution seems to be furnished by Origen, who informs us explicitly that in his time the reading of Matthew was "Bethphage," that of Mark "Bethany," and that of Luke "Bethphage and Bethany," as in our present texts of Luke, and of Mark as well. The third reading is almost certainly a conflation of the other two. Perhaps "Bethphage" is a Palestinian correction of the inaccurate "Bethany" of (pre-Origenian) Mark, and is therefore substituted by Matthew, who makes a similar correction of Mark's geography in Matt. 8, 28. Luke and the post-Origenian texts of Mark conflate. But again demonstration breaks down through inadequate knowledge. Our ignorance both of the

¹ References in Swete ad loc.

ancient geography of Palestine and of the history of the text precludes all positive assertion.

In spite of these manifest limitations it is, nevertheless, possible to adduce strong evidence that Mark is not only "meagre" in geographical data,¹ but inferior in knowledge of Palestinian geography to later evangelists.

(a) The "city" whose residents flock forth to see Jesus after he has exorcised the legion of devils on the "Decapolis" shore of the Lake (Mark 5, 1-20), is to Mark "Gerasa," the chief city of Decapolis according to Josephus, but here a geographic impossibility which Matthew seeks to adjust to the story by substituting "Gadara." But Origen, visiting the region in the third century, easily perceived that even Gadara is still too distant, and proposed to conjecture a "Gergesa" from the "Girgashites" mentioned in Joshua. Continued enquiry by travellers since Origen has succeeded in attaching the name "Kersa" to a portion of the eastern littoral, but is still unable to produce either "steep places," or remains of any "city," such as the story requires. The plain fact seems to be that the author of this characteristically Markan story of exorcism failed to realize the remoteness of "the city of the Gerasenes" in "Decapolis" from the Lake of Galilee.

(b) Careful as he is to distinguish between 'hamlets,' (*ἀγροί*), 'villages' (*κῶμαι*), 'towns' (*κωμοπόλεις*), and 'cities' (*πόλεις*), Red.-Marc., nevertheless, refers in 8, 23 and 26 to Bethsaida Julias, the southern metropolis of Philip's kingdom, as a "village." In 6, 45 he even seems to think of it as situated west of Jordan (verse 53), which leads the modern geographers who are intent chiefly on Gospel harmony to insert two Bethsaidas on the map.

(c) In Mark 7, 31 the expression of the source (7, 24) "borders of Tyre and Sidon," which Matthew 15, 21-22 correctly understands as the frontier region of northern Galilee bordering on Phoenicia, is taken in a distributive sense as implying two separate journeys, first to Tyre, afterwards to Sidon (!);

¹ Compare, for example, the relative richness of the fourth Gospel in identifiable situations in western Palestine. For the portion of the country actually visited in all times by the pilgrim tourist (the road from Jerusalem to Capernaum through Samaria) the fourth evangelist shows closer acquaintance than any.

whence Jesus returns to the Sea of Galilee, "through the borders of Decapolis" (ἀνὰ μέσον τῶν ὁρίων Δεκαπόλεως). In order to reach Caesarea Philippi, the scene of the great self-declaration of Jesus, without omitting the incidents of Dalmanutha (?) and Bethsaida (?) in 8, 10 and 22, a journey from Sidon "through the borders of Decapolis" may have seemed unavoidable to Red.-Marc., but he has never succeeded in making this journey of Jesus in *partibus infidelium* seem plausible either to ancient or to modern minds. Paul gives every indication that he believed Jesus to have remained "a minister of the circumcision because of the promises made to the fathers." Luke cuts out the entire section, eliminating even the name "Caesarea Philippi." Matthew, as usual, takes the more cautious method of removing the difficulty by slight and skilful changes of the wording, so that Jesus never actually leaves Jewish territory or enters a "city of the Gentiles." The healing of the blind man "of Bethsaida" is transferred to less objectionable scenes (cf. Matthew 9, 27-31 and 20, 29-34 with Mark 8, 22-26); while for Mark's "villages of Caesarea Philippi" Matthew substitutes "regions (μέρη) of Caesarea Philippi," implying only a journey to the upper waters of the Jordan. In reality, whereas the source may very well have had "borders of Tyre and Sidon" and "villages (i.e., 'daughter' towns, as in Num. 21, 25, 32; Neh. 11, 25, 27, 28, 30, 31, etc.) of Caesarea Philippi," the extraordinary journey of Jesus in Gentile regions sketched in Mark 7, 24-8, 27, with scarcely any material not duplicating his earlier narrative, is opposed to all we should infer from Paul as well as the later evangelists, and, even if admitted, is described by terms geographically unintelligible.

4. If we turn from Palestinian geography to local history, politics, and conditions, we find even Zahn himself constrained to admit that "in Mark 6, 17 there is real ignorance of the complicated family relationships of the Herods." This understates the case. Zahn's own elaborate explanations of Mark's use of the title "king" for the tetrarch Antipas, and "kingdom" for the tetrarchy, which he offers to hand about as royally as Ahasuerus (cf. Mark 6, 23 with Esth. 5, 3, 6; 7, 2),

fails to disguise the simple fact of error, which for the most part Matthew corrects, though by oversight in one instance (Matt. 14, 9) the word "king" is retained. Luke, on the other hand, not only restores to Antipas his true title, but suppresses the whole Markan story. This is in truth the only reasonable course for an evangelist having before him the far truer depiction of the Baptist and his mission supplied by the Second Source; for the inaccuracies of Mark 6, 17-29 are so flagrant as to lead Holtzmann to apply to it the term "the very pattern of a legend." Its author is clearly not aware that the Baptist met his fate as secretly as possible in the lonely frontier fortress of Machaerus, but depicts it as an accompaniment and foil to scenes of revelry in the palace at Tiberias, "when Herod on his birthday made a feast to his great ones and the chief men of Galilee." Instead of a lonely anchorite of the Judean desert to whom the "dwellers in Jerusalem" go forth in idle or superstitious curiosity (Matt. 11, 7 = Luke 7, 24), Mark conceives the prophet as an Elijah at the court of Ahab and Jezebel, or a Paul before Felix and Bernice, denouncing the unworthy king, plotted against by the wicked queen. The Q material (Matt. 11, 7-10 = Luke 7, 24-28) shows a far more correct idea of John's activity and environment.

Again the critic cannot fail to suspect the Markan combination of "Pharisees and Herodians" as joint conspirators against Jesus' life, in view of the difficulty of accounting for any party of "Herodians" before the accession of Agrippa I (41 A.D.). Here again we are limited by our own inability to prove a "universal negative"; but it is worth noting in view of the admitted ignorance of Mark as to the complicated family relationships of the Herods, and his demonstrable dependence on the Second Source, that in the latter (Luke 13, 31 ff.; cf. Matt. 23, 37 ff.) the Pharisees appear in the rôle of false friends of Jesus seeking to drive him out by the threat, "Herod will kill thee." From such a datum the editorial representations of Mark 3, 6; 8, 15, and 12, 13, would be readily explicable.

We are also limited by our ignorance on the constructive side. In spite of Zahn's confidence, the "Alexander and Rufus" of Mark 15, 21 are not identifiable. Mark stands

alone, it is true, in attaching to the story of the impressment of "Simon of Cyrene" to bear Jesus' cross the statement that this was "the father of Alexander and Rufus," and as Zahn remarks, the only possible purpose of the addition is to give greater interest to the story by connecting it with what was familiar to the readers. In this case "Simon of Cyrene" is clearly unknown, whereas the readers have knowledge of "Alexander and Rufus." But who is this Alexander? And who is Rufus? It is possible that this Rufus is the same mentioned by Paul in Rom. 16, 13, although we hear nothing there of "Alexander." It is also possible that the "letter of commendation" for Phoebe from which the greeting in Rom. 16, 13 is taken was originally addressed to Rome, though there is on the whole better reason to think its original destination Ephesus. The uncertainties of the case are so considerable that the present writer must renounce the attempt to find positive evidence here for Roman provenance, and run the risk of being classed among those with whom "further discussion is useless" because of their lack of "judgment."¹

D. THE "PAULINISM" OF MARK

From the indications of acquaintance (or the lack of it) with Palestinian geography, history, and local conditions, we must turn to a different type of evidence suggesting Roman, or at least Western, provenance for Mark, by comparison with conditions as reflected in the Pauline Epistles, more especially those addressed to, or written from, Rome.

So far from overvaluing this, Zahn falls far short of appreciating the full significance of what he calls "the tendency among Roman Christians (reflected in Rom. 14) that influenced Mark to reproduce in such great detail the discourse concerning things clean and unclean (7, 1-23), and generally to emphasize strongly Jesus' opposition to ceremonialism."

Both the Roman "tendency" (which Mark does not really oppose, but of which this Gospel is rather representative), and its special emphasis on "Jesus' opposition to ceremonialism"

¹ Zahn, Introduction, II, 490.

in general, and to distinctions of meats in particular, are matters which demand our most careful scrutiny; for here we at last touch upon the most distinctive features in the motive and character of Mark. If a relation can really be shown between it and early "tendency" at Rome the value of our enquiry into the provenance of the Gospel will be self-evident.

Paul's Epistle to the Romans gives unmistakable evidence of the predominance in the Roman church of the element we should expect to be in control in the city which the Apostle to the Gentiles looked to as the natural centre of his missionary field. The decisive proof is that the practical exhortations for church order and unity at the close of the Epistle (Rom. 14, 1-15, 13) addressed, as so frequently in Paul (Gal. 6, 1; 1 Thess. 5, 14; 2 Thess. 3, 6-15, etc.), to those "having the leadership" in the church, have as their prevailing note the warning against too inconsiderate, too exclusively self-regarding, application of the Pauline principle of freedom from the ceremonial distinctions of the Law.

As at Corinth, whence Paul had received not long before a request for advice on the various points in dispute between "strong" (those "of Paul") and "weak" (those "of Cephas"), so now at Rome Paul finds it necessary to curb the vaunted liberalism¹ of those who claimed to be his own "imitators" (1 Cor. 1, 12; 11, 1, 2) by reminding them that he himself had always sought to be an "imitator of Christ," who "for the sake of the promises made to the fathers" had voluntarily subjected himself to all the limitations of Mosaism, not pleasing himself, but content to share the reproach (*ὀνειδισμὸς*) of his people (Rom. 15, 1-13; cf. 1 Cor. 8, 1-11, 1). In particular, as to the two distinctive features of Judaism in the Gentile world, the distinctions of days and distinctions of meats, Paul urges (Rom. 14) that scruples which by himself in common with all the "strong" are clearly perceived to be needless, but which the "weak" do not venture to cast aside, should not of

¹ The word is here used (with apologies) in the too common sense of mere relaxation of pre-existing restraints. Paul, in common with other "liberal" leaders, suffered from the misrepresentation of followers concerned only with this negative side of his teaching.

themselves be made a bar to the admission of these latter to the brotherhood. On the contrary, if the "weak" consents to keep his scruples to himself, not making them a matter of "doubtful disputations" by the attempt to impose them on others, the "strong" should make a corresponding sacrifice of conciliation. He should be willing voluntarily to surrender his proper liberty rather than use it at the risk of putting a stumbling-block in the way of one for whom Christ died.

An exhortation of this character and purpose, carried to such large extent, could not possibly occupy the place of main practical emphasis in this church-letter had not the community been really in need of just this warning. At Rome, then, in 55-60 A.D. the church was already tending, as it had previously tended at Corinth, to outrun the liberalism of Paul on its practical side, under the cry: "All things are lawful, all days are holy, all meats are clean." It was in danger of forgetting the Apostle's self-imposed limitation, to become "all things to all men," weak to the weak, bound to those not free, under the law (though really free from it), to those who still feared it, in order "by all means to save some" (Rom. 14, 13-23; cf. 1 Cor. 9, 19-22).

The real and concrete "occasions of stumbling" at Rome were the Jewish distinctions of meats and distinctions of days (Rom. 14, 1-6). It does not appear that Paul apprehended there the more subtle errors of the Apollos tendency prevailing in Corinth. We have, in fact, as little ground to expect in the western metropolis appreciation of the more mystical and deeper elements of Pauline doctrine as we have evidence that they had in reality taken any perceptible hold. Paul's liberty in actual practice, his disregard for the well-known Jewish distinctions of days and distinctions of meats, determined the "Paulinism" of an age which as yet knew little of the great Epistles. They had "been informed concerning him that he taught all the Jews which are among the Gentiles to forsake Moses, telling them not to circumcise their children, neither to walk after the customs." They were not informed of much else. If the author of Acts 21, 21 insists that this is slander, certainly those who claimed freedom as disciples "of Paul" had exceed-

ingly strong grounds for affirming its truth. At least according to Acts 21, 21 they certainly did so affirm. It is the over-emphasis of this negative side of Paul's teaching which the Apostle strives hard to counteract both in First Corinthians and Romans. His effort is proof positive of the existence, and even the predominance, at Rome of a type of "Paulinism," which while sincerely intending to "imitate" the Apostle in all things, in reality overlooked the finer side of his teaching, in particular, his considerate regard and sympathetic appreciation for Jewish scruples and fears regarding distinctions of meats and days. Our contention is that the "Paulinism" of Mark is precisely of the type Paul seeks to hold in check. It has little to do with the literary Paul, but is characterized by exactly this overbearing, inconsiderate, intolerant attitude of the "strong" toward the Jewish "distinctions."

It is no small point of coincidence between Mark and Romans that the Gospel has so much to say about the "man-made" nature of the Mosaic observances (7, 7, 8; 10, 9; cf. Col. 2, 22). It is at least equally noteworthy that the special polemic of the evangelist is waged against the two particular points: (1) distinctions of days (2, 23-3, 6); (2) distinctions of meats (7, 1-23).

As regards theological grounds for this liberalism, the evangelist is almost totally detached from the distinctive tenet of Paul (abolition of the legal relation by the cross); but practically he only differs from Paul as did the unreflecting Paulinists of Corinth and Rome of whom we have just spoken. Theologically he knows that sin is forgiven on simple repentance and faith, no matter how much "the scribes" are horrified at the claim of the Son of Man to forgive sins (2, 1-12). He knows (very much more vaguely) that this forgiveness is somehow promoted, if not conditioned, by Jesus' death on the cross (10, 45; 14, 24).¹ The extreme meagreness of what he has to say on this vital doctrine of the Pauline and Deutero-Pauline Epistles, the gospel of the "atonement" or "reconciliation" (*καταλλαγή*) as Paul calls it (2 Cor. 5, 18-19), is perhaps the

¹ On the relation of Mark to the doctrine of the suffering servant (the *καταλλαγή* doctrine of Paul), see below.

most remarkable thing about Mark's soteriology. It is as un-Pauline a feature as anything in the Gospel. However, even this little is greatly diminished in Matthew, and has entirely disappeared in Luke-Acts. Positively, then, Mark offers a gospel of forgiveness by repentance and faith (1, 15) as in the Second Source (Matt. 21, 32 = Luke 7, 29, 50¹), though without the Lukan explanation and defense (cf. Mark 2, 1-12 with Luke 7, 36-50). This soteriology is connected very vaguely with a doctrine of atonement through the cross. Negatively Red.-Marc. shows his hostility to the Law in a different way from Paul. The Apostle objects to it only as a temporary divine ordinance retained in authority after it had been divinely superseded. Mark objects to it *per se*. To Mark the Jewish ritual observances, irrespective of the distinction introduced by Matthew between Law and tradition, "plantation" and "hedge" (Matt. 15, 12-14), are in general "ordinances of men" (7, 7-8, 14-19; 10, 10-12).² Jewish set fasts no more agree with the new faith than a patch of old cloth on a new garment (2, 18-22). Jewish sabbaths have no authority for the Son of Man, and become an instrument of cruelty and wickedness in the hands of the Pharisees (2, 23-3, 6).³ As in the Second Source, it is Jesus' message of forgiveness to publicans and sinners and his consorting with them which first evokes opposition to him on the part of "the scribes;" but in Mark that which directly leads to the plots against his life on the part of "the Pharisees and Herodians" is his defiance of the Mosaic law of the sabbath (3, 6). There is no attempt (in the true text) to interpret constructively the sanctification of special days. Fasting and sabbath-keeping are treated simply as Jewish practises which the new and higher authority overrides. If wedding guests may disregard the semiweekly Jewish fast-days,

¹ On the Q representation of "John as Preacher of Justification by Faith" see my article under this title in *Expositor*, 8, XVI, 93 (September, 1918).

² This would seem to have been the general Gentile point of view. It is equally characteristic of the source employed in Acts 9, 32-11, 18, though repudiated by Red.-Luc. (Acts. 15).

³ The proverb (quoted also in the Talmud) of 2, 27, which gives a constructive ground for proper disregard of the sabbath is unauthentic. It fails to appear in either Synoptic parallel and is wanting in the β text.

much more the disciples of the Bridegroom — at least while he is with them. If David with his men may disregard the sanctity of the shewbread, much more Jesus and his disciples the sanctity of the sabbath. The issue is baldly that of the stronger authority. Jesus resorts to miracle; the Pharisees to judicial murder.

Jesus' final withdrawal from Galilee is brought about, according to Mark 7, 1-24, by the attempt of the scribes from Jerusalem to impose upon him and his disciples the Mosaic distinctions of clean and unclean meats. Jesus appeals to Isaiah for proof that they are a people of "hypocrites," whose observances are "lip-worship." A logion which in the Q form (Matt. 23, 25-26 = Luke 11, 39-41) merely subordinates ceremonial and external to inward purity, as in the prophets, is greatly extended and elaborated in the same Markan connection (cf. Mark 7, 1-2, 5 with Luke 11, 37-38). Red.-Marc. seeks to prove that Jesus explicitly abolished all the Mosaic distinctions of meats, and that he called the multitude up to him for the purpose of making his meaning and intention unmistakable (7, 14-23). Shortly after (10, 1-12), on a challenge by the Pharisees, he directly sets aside the Mosaic ordinance of divorce as "adultery," contrasting even this as man-made (verse 9) with God's intention as shown in the creation itself. It is not surprising that Luke omits both these radical passages of Mark, while Matthew so changes them as to make Jesus merely favor one school of interpreters against the other.

In the face of the history of Paul's conflict with the older Apostles over this question of holy food and holy days, and especially in the face of his admission that for the sake of the divinely promised prerogative of Israel Jesus had been subject to the Law (Gal. 4, 4-5; Rom. 15, 3, 8-9), it is impossible not to regard as exaggerated this Markan representation. It is not true Paulinism, but the "strong" doctrine of the Corinthian and Roman "imitator of Paul" which makes Jesus explicitly override and abolish the very institutions and ordinances of Moses.¹ In the Q parallels Jesus speaks in no such harsh and

¹ Matthew naturally amends Mark by minute changes intended to prove (what is doubtless the historical fact) that Jesus merely adopted the broader interpreta-

peremptory accents in proclaiming the glad tidings of forgiveness; and even the ceremonial distinctions of holy days and holy foods are treated with relative respect. In Matthew and Luke the Markan radicalism is toned down or omitted.¹ It may, of course, be a Jew who represents the Master in this attitude toward the institutions and religious observances of Judaism, so much harsher, so much less appreciative, than that of the Gentile Luke; but the real point of interest is not so much the possible idiosyncrasy of the evangelist as the disposition of those for whom he wrote; and it is not easy to imagine his representation attaining to quasi-canonical acceptance in any church whose tendencies were not of the "strong" type which Rom. 14, 1-15, 13, shows to have been predominant at Rome.

Let us not misconceive or exaggerate the anti-Judaism of Mark. This Gospel has not the bitter hostility of Matthew against the particular class and sect who in Matthew's view are responsible for his people's apostasy and downfall, the "blind leaders of the blind," the "Scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites," whose fate will be "the damnation of Gehenna" (Matt. 15, 14; 23, 33). But neither does Matthew generalize the charge of "hypocrisy" against "this people" (Mark 7, 5-6)² nor characterize the whole system of distinctions of meats and "washings of cups and pots and brassen vessels" (Mark 7, 3-4) as a "vain worship" practised by "the Pharisees and all the Jews."

In the later period of bitter hostility between Church and Synagogue an Ephesian evangelist speaks without discrimination of Jesus' opponents as simply "the Jews." So even at a much earlier date discrimination between Law and Tradition, synagogue leaders and "people of the land," could seem over-refined to writers and readers of the remoter, western regions of the Empire. In short all the Gospels are anti-Judaistic. So is Paul. But some Gospels are more discriminating than others. Mark in its antipathy to Judaism leans rather to the side of the

tion applied by earlier prophets and contemporary teachers. The contrast, however, between the original Mark, and Mark as corrected by Matthew and Luke, is eloquent of relative nearness to, and sympathy for, Judaism.

¹ So also in the *a* text of Mark 2, 27.

² Didache, however, (c. 8) applies the epithet to the Jews in general as in Mark.

fourth Gospel, where Jesus' opponents are "the Jews," and where he speaks to them of "your law," than to that of Matthew and Luke. He has only a vanishing trace (Mark 12, 38-40) of the Q woes upon scribes and Pharisees, whereas in Luke 11, 37-54 these are still prominent and discriminating; while in Matt. 23, even if Scribe and Pharisee are no longer kept properly distinct but blended in one anti-Christian class, the invective is elaborated and extended both quantitatively and qualitatively. Each Gospel reflects its own period and environment. The Ephesian evangelist presents as the opposition to Jesus "the Jews" as they are known in his time. Matthew opposes the reconstructed synagogue régime of 90-100 A.D. Luke and Mark both commingle data characterized by true historical insight, which they derive from their sources, with a larger or smaller amount of misunderstanding and confusion supplied by the later hand, Red.-Luc., for example, in 16, 14 attempts to create a logical connection with the preceding context by alleging avarice (!) as a distinctive sin of the Pharisees.¹ The point for us to observe, however, is that in this commixture the proportion of the authentic and correct to the late and incorrect is decidedly greater in Luke than in Mark.

Thus in Mark 2, 23, if ὁδὸν ποιεῖν be authentic—Matt. and D omit—and not a mere misrendering of the Hebrew or Aramaic idiom for "went along plucking" (ὁδὸν ποιεῖσθαι), Red.-Marc. holds that the Pharisees objected to what the disciples were doing as being equivalent to "road-building" (ὁδὸν ποιεῖν) on the sabbath. Of course some sort of manual labor is the ground of pettifogging complaint, not the mere eating of the grain, for this was expressly allowed. Luke 6, 1 restores sense by supplying the act to which objection was really taken. They were "rubbing out the kernels with their hands" (ψάχοντες ταῖς χερσίν) and so (technically) threshing.²

¹ The true connection appears by omitting 16, 1-13, and attaching after verse 15 the parable of the Pharisee and Publican (18, 9-14). The really distinctive sin of the Pharisee (self-righteousness) is described correctly in verse 15. But Red.-Luc. changes the order for reasons of his own. See Bacon, "Order of Lukan Interpolations," *Journal of Biblical Literature*, XXXVII (1918), pp. 42, 43.

² The comment of Gould (*International Critical Commentary*), though approved by Swete, is an example of that sacrifice of the text to the supposed exi-

The superiority of Luke to Mark on this score of appreciation of things Jewish is more strikingly evinced in the story of Jesus' arrest and trial, which in the nature of the case did not admit the formal convening (at midnight!) of the Sanhedrin at the house of Annas; still less their dismissal after trial and condemnation of Jesus (through agency of suborned witnesses), and their reconvening at dawn to accuse Jesus before Pilate. Even did the few hours of time permit all this official action, the very last thing desired by Jesus' priestly enemies was to assume official responsibility for his fate. The more secretly, expeditiously, and irresponsibly he could be handed over to Pilate as an insurrectionist the better for their purpose; publicity would be ruinous. In general, therefore, as Brandt¹ has so clearly shown, the Markan representation of a formal trial before the Sanhedrin, in which Jesus takes the part in maintaining his own claim to be the exalted "Son of Man" which was taken later by Christian martyrs, whereas the supreme representative council of the Jewish people plays the part of false accuser, must be regarded as largely imaginative. Its most incredible feature of all, however, is produced by Red.-Marc.'s insertion of this scene of trial in 14, 53 b-64, between the statement (of his source) that the posse of arrest "led Jesus away to the high-priest" and its continuation in verse 65 that some of them (i.e., the menials who held the victim) began to spit on him, and to cover his face and buffet him, and to say unto him "prophesy!" The effect of this insertion is that the "some" who engage in this brutal abuse are members of the Jewish senate (!) at the close of a formal session of exceptional solemnity, a session attended (we are to suppose) by a Joseph of Arimathea and a Nicodemus.

Luke has not entirely eliminated the impossible Markan trial scene, but he has at least postponed it till daylight (Luke 22,

gencies of the sense which is the mortal sin of the exegete. "To make a road by plucking the ears" may be "an absurd way of making a road," but absurdity is just that of which Red.-Marc. would convict the Pharisees who make the charge. The rabbinic parallels cited by J. Lightfoot (*Horae Hebraicae*, on Matt. 12, 2) show that the complaint may also have been directed against the plucking as being a kind of "reaping."

¹ *Evangelische Geschichte*, 1893.

66-71), and he attributes the brutal abuse of the prisoner to "the men that held him" in detention until daylight in the courtyard of the high priest's palace.

The noticeable point about the inferiority of Mark to Luke in this instance is not merely the earlier evangelist's lower degree of appreciation of things Jewish, but also the attitude of general antipathy which makes the misrepresentation possible. Such a conception would hardly be developed and find currency in circles where men had actually seen sessions of the Jewish Sanhedrin. In short the indiscriminate anti-Judaism of Mark makes it extremely improbable that it owes its present form to an Oriental environment. Compared with the tendencies of which Paul seems chiefly apprehensive at Rome, it confirms to no small extent the tradition of Roman provenance.

E. ATTITUDE TOWARD JEWISH-CHRISTIAN LEADERS

Connected with this anti-Jewish radicalism of Mark is a phenomenon of the Gospel in which it contrasts even more conspicuously with Matthew and Luke, and whose character would be almost unaccountable in the East — or indeed in the West at any period much later than First Peter (87 A.D.). I refer to the depreciatory attitude of this Gospel toward the Galilean Apostles, especially Peter, and toward the kindred of the Lord, the so-called *δεσπόσυννοι*, who formed a sort of caliphate at the centre of the Palestinian mother church until its dispersal in 135 A.D.

When we reflect that the wide and dominating influence secured by Mark toward the close of the first century was due to the claim put forth on its behalf (a claim which is in some degree and in a limited sense justified by the internal evidence) that it represents *ἀπομνημονεύματα Πέτρου*, there can be few things more startling than to take unbiased account of its actual report wherever the individual figure of Peter appears.

At bottom it is apparent that many elements of the Markan story, especially at beginning and end, must be derived from Peter. The scenes of the Beginnings at Capernaum (1, 16-39; 2, 1-4, 11-12) and of the Night of Betrayal (14, 17-54, 65-72) are not explicable unless based, more or less directly, on Peter's

story. Nevertheless the Gospel did not win its first standing under the name of Peter, but under that of one of the lieutenants of Paul. Moreover, so far from giving special prominence or commendation to Peter, as is done in Luke-Acts, and still more strikingly in Matthew,¹ Mark never introduces the Apostle to the circumcision for any individual part without making him the target for severe reproof and condemnation.

1. This manifestly applies to the story of the Night of Betrayal, where Peter's boastful claim to a loyalty beyond that of any of the rest marks the beginning (14, 29-31) of a narrative which makes Peter the example of unfaithful watching (14, 37; cf. Luke 22, 45-46), and whose climax (verses 54, 65-72) is Peter's humiliating and cowardly denial of his Master at the challenge of a maid-servant. True, as the surviving references in 14, 27-28 and 16, 7 imply, this story of Peter's denial was originally but the prelude to the Apostle's "turning again," the story of how the church first came to conscious life through the resurrection faith when Peter "stablished his brethren" in his own new-born faith.² For this pioneer triumph of the faith over the gates of Sheol that had closed upon Jesus, Peter deserves the name of its foundation "Rock." None is more prompt than Paul himself to acknowledge a supreme and common obligation from "circumcision" and "uncircumcision" alike to him who had been first to receive the revelation of the risen Lord (1 Cor. 15, 5; cf. Gal. 2, 7-8). But this is just the portion of the Petrine story which Mark (as we know it) has suppressed.

Mark, in the oldest form known to us, breaks off abruptly at 16, 8, leaving unfulfilled the promise to "the disciples and Peter" of an appearance "in Galilee." Nor can this abrupt ending be due to accident. Mere mutilation of one particular

¹ See Bacon, "Petrine Supplements of Matt." in *Expositor*, 8, XIII, (1917), 73.

² Luke 22, 28-32 has a parallel fragment also attaching the story of Simon's turning again to the "covenant" (*διαθήκη*) of the Supper. The Petrine Supplement of Matt. 14, 28-33 shows (if the conclusions of the *Expositor* article above cited are correct) that the story of the Walking on the Sea (victory over Sheol) symbolizes the ultimate triumph of Peter's faith (through interposition of the risen Christ) over his earlier collapse. These fragments, together with a few others less important, are all that survive of what Paul refers to in 1 Cor. 15, 1-11 as the original and apostolic resurrection story.

MS would not account for it unless this MS were the only one obtainable for multiplication; and even on this highly fanciful supposition it cannot be imagined that no oral tradition remained from which an early editor could reconstruct the story. The tradition known to "more than five hundred brethren" in Paul's time as kindred to their own experience did not suddenly cease to exist. It has disappeared from Mark because something different was preferred. The change which begins in Mark and from it passes on to Matthew and Luke is nothing less than a revolt from the apostolic resurrection-gospel reported in 1 Cor. 15, 1-11, whose primary manifestation is "to Peter." In place of this common narrative proclaimed by all (verse 11) in Paul's time, Mark has "another gospel," of which not one hint or trace appears in Paul. The nucleus of this secondary resurrection-gospel, which knows no more of the incidents of the apostolic than the apostolic knows of it, is the story of the Empty Tomb reported by the women. This story begins the new theme which is taken up in 15, 40. After Mark 15, 40-16, 8, room was still found (in a form of Mark no longer extant) for an appearance "to Peter and the Eleven." But the bringing in of this as a kind of supplement, after the women have received the Easter message, is manifestly secondary, and the mutilated Mark of the earliest MSS has suppressed even this.¹ A Gospel in which the original resurrection appearance to Peter is first made secondary to the story of the women at the sepulchre, and next cancelled altogether, can hardly have developed where Peter was the supremely revered authority.

2. Peter plays an individual part in but three other passages of Mark.² The first of these is the so-called Confession of Peter, from the fact that in Matthew's reconstructed form of the story it tells of the original confession of Jesus as "the Christ, the Son of the Living God." Matthew (not Mark) follows this

¹ A trace still remains in Ev. Petri; but here too the story breaks off at the point where the disciples, ignorant of the women's experience, have spent the remainder of the Passover week in Jerusalem "mourning and weeping" in hiding from the Jews. Thereafter, as in John 21, 1 ff., they return under Peter's lead, to their fishing in Galilee.

² The reminder Mark 11, 21 is entirely colorless, and can scarcely be reckoned an "individual part."

up with the well-known Beatification of Peter for the revelation and his endowment with the power of the keys (Matt. 16, 16-20). Doubtless in its basic feature (Peter as leader of the Twelve in the acceptance of the messianistic program now proposed by Jesus) Matthew's reconstruction restores a genuine element of the history which Mark obscures. For in Mark there is no revelation. Peter merely answers as he is expected to answer. To all except "those without" Jesus in Mark has been "the Christ" from the baptism. Even "those without" would know it from the unwilling witness of shrieking demons, did not Jesus purposely silence them.¹ Per contra, Peter becomes at this point the representative and spokesman of the false (Jewish) idea of Christhood which in the Second Source is enunciated by Satan (!) and incurs the frightful *Apage Satanas* of the Temptation story, accompanied by the declaration that his opposition to the gospel of the cross represents the things "of men," not those "of God" (Mark 8, 27-33).

3. The second of the remaining individual appearances of Peter in Mark repeats, in the symbolic form of apocalyptic vision, the lesson of the incident of the Confession of which we have just spoken. On the Mount of Transfiguration, "Peter, James and John" receive the revelation of the true nature of the "Son of God," and of his calling to be a redeemer from death (Mark 9, 2-10). Peter plays an individual part only to receive rebuke for his "ignorant" desire to substitute a permanent abiding with the Christ in the "tabernacles" of the present fleshly body² for "metamorphosis" into the body of glory. The imaginative vision-story suffuses the matter-of-

¹ On this Markan "hiding of the mystery of the kingdom from those without," see Wrede, *Das Messiasgeheimnis*, 1901. The common impression that the disciples first learn of Jesus' Christhood at Caesarea Philippi (Mark 8, 27-30) is due to the modern line of approach, through Matt. 16, 17. Viewed simply in their own light, unaffected by later parallels, the series of statements Mark 1, 1, 11, 24, 34; 2, 10, 19, 28; 3, 11; 4, 41 makes a very different impression. It is the false ideal of Christhood, the Jewish ideal, intolerant of a suffering and dying Christ, which is rebuked (in Peter as its spokesman) in Mark 8, 27-33. The Temptation story has the same function in Q, the Tempter being here the spokesman of the unworthy ideal.

² In this sense *σκηνή*, *σκηνοῦν*, are almost technical terms in the New Testament. Cf. 2 Cor. 5, 1; John 1, 14; 2 Peter 1, 14.

fact narrative, into the midst of which it has been rather abruptly interjected, with the doctrinal content of 2 Cor. 3, 12 — 5, 10. Peter's apostleship is thus enriched with the mystical meaning given by Paul to the "ministry of the new covenant."

4. The third remaining individual appearance of Peter in Mark is as spokesman for the Twelve in the appeal: "Lo, we have left all and followed thee; what then shall we have?" (Mark 10, 28-31). The rebuke called forth by this self-seeking petition forms part of a group the lesson of which is renunciation (Mark 10, 13-45; cf. Luke 14, 25-35).

From special references to Peter, we may pass next to Markan references to the two sons of Zebedee, James and John, who in ancient tradition stand next after Peter in consideration. The pair take a more prominent part even than Peter in the renunciation group just mentioned, because of their martyr fate. In voluntarily undertaking to share Jesus' cup they go to the extreme limit of renunciation. Even James and John, however, are here denied a claim to special rank or privilege. Their ambitious request, like Peter's, is treated by Mark as presumptuous (10, 32-45). The only other separate appearance of "the sons of Zebedee" in Mark is the mention of their designation as "sons of thunder" in 3, 17. The significance of it is problematical. On the other hand, in Mark 9, 38-39, "John" is rebuked for narrow intolerance. No other separate mention is made of this "pillar" apostle. The group "Peter, James, and John" appears on several occasions, the special significance of which is not entirely clear,¹ and in two instances (1, 16-20; 13, 3) Andrew, Peter's brother, is added to the group. Andrew has no individual rôle whatever. No other Apostle plays any part in Mark. Only Matt. 10, 3, in a gloss attached to the name "Matthew," attempts to say which of the Twelve is to be identified with "Levi son of Alphaeus" (Mark 2, 14), and "Matthew" is on this ground substituted for "Levi" in the

¹ See, however, Bacon, "The Martyr Apostles," in *Expositor*, 7, IV, 21 (Sept., 1907). The two Jameses, both martyrs, both prominent in the Jerusalem church, were naturally confused at an early date. It is possible that one reason for the Markan group "Peter, James, and John" is the fact that Paul mentions these three names as those of the "pillars" at Jerusalem (Gal. 2, 9), though the "James" there meant is not the Son of Zebedee.

dependent version of the story (Matt. 9, 9). Levi also remains functionless in the rest of Mark.¹ The amount and character of this mention of individual Apostles and groups of Apostles in Mark suggests slight interest in the body so revered in the Palestinian church, and that interest not untinctured with opposition. It is not easy to imagine such references had the Gospel grown up in the circle where, at the very time the Elders Aristion and John were relating their "traditions," others of the same group could relate "what Andrew or Peter had said, or Philip, or Thomas, or James, or John, or Matthew, or any other of the Lord's disciples."

The Twelve as a whole, and Jesus' "mother and brethren," the group who are associated with them in the Jerusalem caliphate, fare no better in Mark than Peter and other individual Apostles. Jesus' kindred appear on two occasions only, in both cases in alliance with his opponents, and as typical examples of Jewish unbelief (3, 21; 6, 4, "his own kin"). Jesus disowns them in favor of those who "do the will of God," taking the disciples to be his spiritual kin (3, 34-35). But the Twelve themselves suffer from the same Jewish *πῶρως*. They too are repeatedly rebuked for being "without understanding." They share in the "hardening" of their less privileged fellow-countrymen (4, 13, 40; 6, 52; 7, 18; 8, 16-21; 9, 18-19, 28, 32; 10, 13-14, 24, 26, 32; 14, 50), so that Peter's rebuke for "minding not the things of God, but the things of men" is only the culminating instance of a condemnation that rests on the Jews in general. But to Mark's doctrine of the "hardening" (*πῶρως*) of Israel we must devote fuller discussion; for at this point we again find ourselves face to face with a highly significant connection of the Gospel with the Epistle to the Romans.

F. MARKAN VERSUS PAULINE DOCTRINE OF THE HARDENING OF ISRAEL

The most distinctive feature of Romans is the Apostle's great survey of human history from the Jewish point of view of the

¹ In Ev. Petri he reappears in the group who return with Peter to their fishing in Galilee after the crucifixion. The fragment breaks off after the mention of his name.

Election of Israel, a theodicy which forms the second part of this Epistle's doctrinal body (Rom. 9-11). It brings forward Paul's well known theory of the "hardening" (*πάρωσις*) of the elect people, perhaps the most strained of any of his distinctive views.

Paul regards the callousness of Israel to the gospel message as divinely ordained for the purpose of securing the dissemination of the gospel among the Gentiles. For he anticipates that Israel itself (the natural olive-branches) will afterwards through jealousy be provoked to reconsider its unbelief, and thus be restored again to the native trunk whereon the Gentiles (the wild olive branches) had meantime been grafted. This theodicy of history and the doctrine of election is based by Paul on a number of Scripture passages, including a secondary form (Deut. 29, 3) of the famous Isaian complaint of the people of deaf ears and unseeing eyes (Isa. 6, 9-10; 29, 10, etc.). By modern interpreters it is generally regarded as an apologetic intended to parry the objection of heathen opponents that Jesus' own people rejected his claim to be their predicted Messiah.¹

So far as it goes this interpretation is correct. None appreciates better than Red.-Marc. the apologetic value of the Pauline doctrine of the "hardening of Israel." But Paul makes no such application. These famous chapters of Romans are introduced, on the contrary, by the most touching profession of undying love and loyalty to

my kinsmen according to the flesh, who are Israelites; whose is the Adoption, and the Glory (Shekinah), and the Covenants, and the Giving of the Law, and the Worship, and the Promises; whose are the Fathers, and of whom is Christ, as concerning the flesh.

The tone of this contrasts as vividly with that of 1 Thess. 2, 15-16 and Galatians as a whole, on the one side, as with that of the Markan story of Jesus' disowning of his "kinsmen according to the flesh" on the other. Paul, the great peacemaker, the true Apostle of Love of the New Testament, appears in a new light in the Epistles which follow Galatians and First and Second Thessalonians. In Romans, as in First Corinthians, he

¹ Urged by Celsus in the second century, who speaks for Jewish predecessors. See Origin, *Contra Celsum*, ii. 75-79.

emphasises the other side of his doctrine of freedom. In Rom. 14, 1 ff, he interceded, as we have seen, on behalf of those who in Corinth had professed to be imitators "of Cephas," the needlessly scrupulous Jewish Christians. He entreats the Roman leaders not to exclude the "weak" brother. Previously, in the great chapters on the Election (Rom. 9-11) Paul had made the highest possible use of the obnoxious claim of Jewish prerogative. He argues almost like one of his old-time opponents. But his interpretation of the doctrine is in the interest of peace. His ideal is the ultimate union of Jew and Gentile in the new creation, the "one new man" which is Christ Jesus.

The historical key to Paul's peculiar emphasis upon this central doctrine of Jewish particularism and his large interpretation of it in specially conciliatory tone in just this Epistle to the Romans is not to be found in any special requirement of apologetic, but in the tone of conciliation and peace-making toward those of "Cephas" which becomes increasingly prominent in all the letters after Galatians, beginning with First Corinthians. It is clear from Rom. 15, 31 how deeply Paul had at heart the success of his peace-making mission to Jerusalem. On the other hand we may see from the direct appeal in Rom. 14, 1 ff. that the attitude of at least the controlling element in the church at Rome toward Jewish "distinctions" was such that, but for Paul's intercession, the authorities might have gone so far as to exclude altogether the "weak" brother who feared to disregard Moses. From these considerations we must form our conception of tendencies in the church at Rome in 60 A.D., and of the temper of the dominant party, who here, as in Corinth, probably considered themselves to be imitators "of Paul" because of their opposition to those "of Cephas." Events which followed in the next two decades are not likely to have diminished the "Paulinism" of the Gentile churches, whether in Greece or Italy. From First Peter it would appear that the subsequent drawing together of "strong" and "weak" in all quarters was a compensating outcome of the world-wide persecutions "for the name" of Christian under Domitian.

The fact that the doctrine of the "hardening of Israel" (*πάρρωσις*) plays a very conspicuous part in the Gospel of Mark

is undeniable. That the classic proof-text from Isa. 6, 9-10 should be borrowed and developed by all dependent evangelists (Acts 28, 26-27; Matt. 13, 14-15; John 12, 37-43) is far from surprising. But there are two notable facts concerning the Markan employment apart from the generally recognized "Paulinism" of Mark 4, 11-12. One is that the doctrine of *πρώωσις* in Mark is by no means confined to this one passage, but extends throughout the Gospel, forming indeed the very core and kernel of the evangelist's peculiar theory so effectively exhibited in Wrede's epoch-making work, "Das Messiasgeheimniss," of the "hiding of the mystery of the kingdom." The other notable point is that the Gospel employs this theory of *πρώωσις*, not as Paul does, but in the interest of apologetic (not to say polemic) against Judaism within or without the Church. If there is any trace of Paul's peace-making climax, his loyal hope and faith that in the end all Israel would also turn again and be saved (Rom. 11, 13-32), it appears only in the form of symbolism. In the present writer's commentary¹ the judgment is expressed that the episode of the boy possessed of the dumb devil (Mark 9, 14-29) is placed where it is, and developed as it is, by Red.-Marc. with this symbolic application in view. This opinion, still maintained, would support the view that Mark shares the optimism of Paul regarding Israel; but it is an interpretation which has yet to find general acceptance.

The depiction of Jesus' career characteristic of Mark (and subsequently dominant, though undiscoverable in Paul) is that of the wonder-working "strong Son of God," to whom yield not only demons and he that hath the power of death, but the very elements and powers of earth and heaven. But this representation involves a psychological difficulty. How then (it would be answered) was there no reaction to these extraordinary phenomena from friend or foe until after the crucifixion? How could such superhuman pretensions be publicly advanced, and yet the question of Jesus' personality remain in abeyance (as it confessedly did) until the crisis in Jerusalem? The actual employment of arguments of this kind by Celsus² in slightly

¹ Beginnings of Gospel Story, ad loc.

² Origen, Contra Celsum, l. ii, passim.

varied form shows that in the earlier Jewish polemic it had not been neglected. It is met in Mark by a constant application of the "wisdom" doctrine frequently employed by Paul (1 Cor. 2, 7-11; Rom 16, 25, etc.) of the "hiding of the mystery" from all but the elect. A form of the Q logion to this effect (Matt. 11, 25 = Luke 10, 21) is introduced by Red.-Marc. in 4, 11-12, together with his own proof-text from Isa. 6, 9-10, at a point where it flagrantly interrupts the original connection, transforming Jesus' answer to a request for explanation of the parables into an explanation of why he uses parables. They were riddles, or dark sayings (so Red.-Marc. declares), employed in order to hide the mystery of the kingdom from all save the elect! Here, then, is the evangelist's explanation of the lack of reaction to Jesus' teaching: Israel's eyes and ears were holden that they should not understand. A Roman Paulinist might well be expected to make some such application of Paul's two doctrines of the "hiding of the mystery" and the "hardening of Israel"; but what shall we say of the supposititious Jew and Oriental who thinks of the *mashal* as a riddling *αἰνιγμα*, the illustration as a dark saying?

A similar theory of intentional repression is applied in Mark to the miracles. Jesus withdraws from publicity. He forbids the healed, even the parents of the resuscitated girl, to make the marvel known. He silences the cries of demons "because they knew him." When at last his secret was perforce "openly" spoken of to the Twelve, "he forbade them to make him known" (8, 27-32a). The vision of the Transfiguration, especially, with its unveiling of his true nature and mission, must be kept a secret "until the Son of Man be risen from the dead" (9, 9).

All this is not "pedagogic reserve." It may have a certain background of historic truth in Jesus' wholesome moral reaction from the career of a miracle-mongering *γῶης*; but the phenomenon is more literary than historical. Its real explanation lies in the habitual practice of pseudepigraphic and apocalyptic literature. The revelation has always to be "hidden for the time to come," because otherwise the reader will say: How is it that all this marvel transpired so late?

The "wonder-loving Mark" feels the pressure of the oft-raised objection, and meets it by his own adaptation (probably resting on the Second Source¹) of the Isaian doctrine of the deaf and blind servant. In particular he weaves together, as we have seen, in a typical editorial insertion (Mark 4, 11-12), a combination of Paul's classic theme of the "hiding of the mystery" with the principal proof-text from Isa. 6, 9-10, and in addition explains the incredible blindness and dumbness of unbelieving Jews, in which even those who later believe are involved, by constant reiteration of the declaration that "their hearts were hardened." This may perhaps not be due to any direct literary influence from Romans, but the locality above all others in which we should most naturally look for such an adaptation of the theory of *πῶρωσις* in antijudaic apologetic would certainly be that to which that epistle was addressed.

G. MARKAN CHRISTOLOGY

One more point of contact between Mark and Romans, a feature closely connected with its doctrine of *πῶρωσις*, or the "hiding of the mystery of the kingdom," deserves consideration before we pass to other features which connect this Gospel with practices and institutions otherwise known to have prevailed in very early times among Christians at Rome. We must consider the peculiar Christology of Mark, which on the heretical side led Cerinthus and his adoptionist followers to make it their standard, and on the orthodox led independently in the regions represented respectively by Luke and Matthew to the prefixing of "infancy chapters" which by different methods seek an accommodation between the Hellenistic idea of virgin birth and the primitive Jewish of direct Davidic descent.

Among other features which, under the conception already voiced of conditions at Rome, will seem quite natural to the Epistle to the Romans, will be the Apostle's reference in two passages (Rom. 1, 4; 9, 5) to the fact that "as concerning the flesh" Jesus himself had been a Jew. In the former passage

¹ Cf. Matt. 11, 2-19; 12, 17-21 with Luke 7, 18-35.

(Rom. 1, 4) Paul even endorses the belief represented in the (conflicting) genealogies of Matthew and Luke, that "according to the flesh" Jesus really was "born of the seed of David"; though he goes on to point out that his "appointment in power" as the Son of God was only "by the resurrection from the dead." In this opposition between "a Christ according to the flesh" (2 Cor. 5, 16¹; cf. Mark 8, 33 τὰ τῶν ἀνθρώπων) and a Christ "appointed" by the resurrection "according to the Spirit of holiness" (Rom. 1, 4) we have Paul's epiphany doctrine, which in doctrinal viewpoint corresponds with the transfiguration story of the Synoptists. These have, of course, no real incarnation doctrine such as Paul's of the pre-existent Wisdom (λόγος) of God, their nearest approach being the Baptism story, whose doctrinal content is the equivalent in terms of mystic vision of Paul's theological statement in Col. 1, 13, 19. Neither of these symbolic elements of Mark is really assimilated by the evangelist. Baptism and Transfiguration alike stand apart from the context as foreign material unexplained.

On the other hand, Paul's doctrine of the appointment (ὀρίζειν) is based on Psalm 110, 1. This appears from his frequent use of the phrase "at the right hand of God"; indeed, in two Pauline passages (1 Cor. 15, 25-28; Eph. 1, 20-22) this proof-text is combined with Psalm 8, 5-7. Furthermore, a Deutero-Pauline epistle probably addressed to Rome and slightly earlier than Mark (Hebrews) develops an elaborate Christology on the basis of these same two proof-texts. This Epistle, after first (2, 5-9) elaborating Psalm 8, 5-7, makes special development of the later context of Psalm 110, 1 to teach that Christ is the predicted priest-king "after the order of Melchizedek," since his dynasty, like Melchizedek's, is without a genealogy (ἀγενεαλόγητος), "without father or mother, having neither beginning nor end of days." This is generally admitted to represent an Alexandrian type of development of

¹ The reference in this passage is not (as sometimes supposed) to contact of Paul with Jesus during the ministry, a contact denied by Paul's opponents and never claimed by him. The reference (as shown by the phrase κατὰ σάρκα here and in Rom. 1, 4) is to the expected Jewish Messiah κατὰ τὰ τῶν ἀνθρώπων.

the Pauline Christology. At all events it employs the same proof-texts and makes the same contrast between "a Christ after the flesh" and a Christ brought into the presence of the angels as the Son of God (Heb. 1, 6). This clearly involves a complete declaration of independence of the Palestinian or Jewish-Christian Christology, in which the title "Son of David" long continued to be taken in the most literal sense.

When we turn to the Gospel of Mark, we find (as in Paul) a bare trace or two (10, 48-49; 11, 10) of the early (perhaps authentic) belief in Jesus' Davidic descent. But so little value attaches to it that the reader remains wholly in the dark as to whether Jesus is, or is not, actually descended from David. Genealogy there is none. On the contrary, the only way in which the matter is brought up at all is in an awkwardly appended ¹ supplement (12, 35-37) to the three party questions raised and debated in the temple. After the colophon "And no man after that durst ask him any question," Jesus is represented as himself raising the question of his own claims to Messiahship, and settling it (by implication) on the basis of Psalm 110, 1.² He is to be manifested as Son of God by exaltation to the right hand of power! If he is descended from David, this fact has no value or bearing on the case. That a doctrine of this kind should be maintained in that seat of western and Gentile Christianity which had received the Epistle to the Romans (and quite recently in all probability Hebrews as well) need not surprise us. That it should be current and acceptable in the Aramaic-speaking circles of the Eastern church would pass comprehension.

The Christology of Mark is really composite. That of the evangelist himself is a massive supernaturalism somewhat crudely adjusted to two bases of older Jewish vision story — the baptism and transfiguration. The work is superscribed "Beginning of the gospel of Jesus Christ the Son of God." It ends its account of the ministry with the scene of the Roman centurion standing before the cross, awe-struck at the portents

¹ This is made only the more conspicuous by Matthew's corrective transposition.

² Some texts, however, omit "the Son of God."

attending the tragedy, and exclaiming, "Truly this man was a son of God." This type of "strong" Christology (if we may use this term) characterizes the Gospel throughout, and passes on from it to its satellites, though not without attempted adjustment to the more consistently Jewish Christology of the Second Source. In Mark the figure of the superhuman hero, the demi-god, more Gentile than Jewish, is superimposed throughout the Gospel upon that of the *παῖς* or *υἱὸς θεοῦ* of the baptism (which the temptation story of Q interprets in the sense of Jewish wisdom), and the Son of Man Christology of the transfiguration. The former Christology is the basis of Mark 1, 9-11. It verges as closely upon adoptionism as the latter, presupposed in 9, 2-10, verges on docetism. The Gentile capstone superimposed upon these two Jewish pillars is, as already stated, the massive supernaturalism of the evangelist's own belief. The true Markan Christ is the superhuman wonder-worker, who silences the claims of the Law by an act of supernatural power (2, 6-10; 28), and imposes obedience on wind and sea (4, 41) as well as on demonic powers (5, 6-7). This "strong" Christology, as we have termed it, is of course very far from the "high Christology" of Paul. But it certainly does not differ in the direction of greater sympathy or appreciation for Jewish thought. The evangelist embodies the two vision scenes of the baptism and transfiguration; but he does not show toward them the appreciation or understanding we should expect from one of Jewish birth or training. His readers must interpret them for themselves. The evangelist no more explains these scenes than he explains the title Son of Man, which he boldly adopts, or the doctrine of the suffering Servant, which he presupposes in 10, 45 and 14, 24.

When we look from this composite, ill-digested Christology of Mark to the improvements attempted by the later Synoptists, it is easy to see the true nature of their prefixed infancy chapters. Independently Matthew and Luke endeavor to accommodate the "strong" "Son of God" doctrine of Mark to the older Jewish conception of the "Son of David." The almost out and out adoptionism of the opening scene of Mark 1, 9-11, in which, as Wellhausen puts it, "Jesus goes down into the water a

simple mechanic of Nazareth; he comes up out of it the chosen Son of God," could not permanently be tolerated. The flux of which each of the later Synoptists independently avails himself, in order to fuse into a workable amalgam this Markan adoptionism and the Jewish theocratic conception of the Son of David reflected in the genealogies is the story of Virgin Birth. True, it cannot really be harmonized with the genealogies; but it is not in the least un-Jewish. On the contrary, the epithet *θεόγονος* applied to Isaac by Hellenistic Jews, and Paul's references to Isaac's birth through the operation of a divine word of promise (Rom. 4, 17-22; 9, 9), show parthenogenesis in its proper interpretation to be entirely congenial to Judaism. At all events this doctrine serves to bridge the chasm between the *ἀγενεαλόγητος* Christology of Mark, almost defiantly independent of what the scribes say as to the Davidic descent of "the Christ" (Mark 12, 37-39), and the primitive Palestinian doctrine of human parentage. For we have already observed that Paul acknowledges the Davidic descent of Jesus as matter of fact (Rom. 1, 4; 9, 5; Gal. 4, 4), even while he bases his own doctrine on the exaltation to "the right hand of God" (1, 4; 8, 34).¹

Some of the steps by which we have endeavored to trace the complicated development of primitive Christology through action and reaction between Jewish and Hellenistic conceptions of various kinds may fail to win the reader's assent. Of one thing, however, we are persuaded. No competent student who surveys on the one side the "strong" Christology of Mark, and on the other the compromises and adjustments of the later Synoptists can say that the better title to emanate from Palestinian soil lies with the earlier. On the contrary, Mark reflects the same contrast as Romans and Hebrews between the Christ "of the seed of David according to the flesh" and the Christ who is "manifested" as the Son of God by exaltation to the "right hand," in Deutero-Pauline, Alexan-

¹ For the "manifestation" (*ἐπιφάνεια*) to the multitude at the baptism, the fourth evangelist very naturally substitutes a "manifestation of his glory" (John 2, 11) to the disciples at Cana by a miracle corresponding to that characterizing the manifestation ("epiphany") of Dionysus on Jan. 5-6. See "After Six Days," Bacon, *Harvard Theological Review*, VIII (Jan., 1915), pp. 94-121.

drian Christology, "a high priest forever, without father, without mother, without a genealogy." So far from showing appreciation of, or consideration for, the native Jewish type of Christology, it eliminates entirely the genealogies, and leaves the reader uncertain whether the acclamation of the blind beggar at Jericho and the crowd at Jerusalem have, or have not, any basis in fact. Its only reference to the subject is the supplementary question appended to the series of debates between Jesus and his Jewish opponents in the temple, the scornful:

How say the scribes that the Christ is the son of David? David himself said in the Holy Spirit:

The Lord said unto my Lord,
Sit thou on my right hand
Till I make thine enemies thy footstool.

H. ROMAN RITUAL AS AFFECTING MARK

The most specifically Roman trait in Mark is found in the sphere of early ritual and observance, matters which in the East especially are clung to with intense devotion. The principal feature of this kind belongs, like Mark's ultra-Pauline apologetic and Christology, to a stratum of the Gospel which is clearly secondary. It is all the more conspicuous because in this case undeniably in conflict with the basic story.

We have, unfortunately, for the trait in question no designation simpler than "Anti-quartodecimanism." The recognition of its specifically Roman (or at all events western) character depends on familiarity with the early history of the observance of the Church's one great annual festival, the Easter feast of Redemption, which combined characteristics of the Jewish feast of national redemption (Passover) with the much more widely-observed Oriental feast of resurrection celebrated in commemoration of the triumph over death of various redeemer-gods, such as Attis, Adonis, and Osiris. The celebration took place among the churches of Cappadocia, and in Tertullian's time at Rome itself, annually, on the 25th of March, the vernal equinox of the Julian calendar. It can be traced, of course, much further back than the celebration of the birth of Jesus on December 25th (Julian winter solstice, the dies invicti

solis); in fact it goes back beyond question to the Apostles themselves. This is not merely the claim of Polycarp in 154, it is easily demonstrable from Paul's references to "keeping the feast" of "Christ, our passover," and his employment of the passover imagery of the "new leaven," and the seed-corn which after perishing in the earth is divinely restored. It appears also from the references to Christ as the first-fruits (*ἀπαρχή*) of the buried saints (1 Cor. 5, 7-8; 15, 20, 35-37).

Polycarp, as representative of the churches of Asia in this observance at Rome in 154, claimed to have it by direct and unbroken succession from "the Apostles and disciples of the Lord," and there is every reason to admit this claim since Paul himself, unless all implications are deceptive, when he wrote from Ephesus to the Corinthians on the questions involved in the meaning of the Easter observances, was himself at the time engaging in them with the Ephesian church. The present writer has expressed the belief¹ that the "Scripture" on the ground of which Paul (in common with all the early preachers of the resurrection, 1 Cor. 15, 11) dated the mysterious unseen act of divine power which broke the gates and bars of Sheol as having taken place "on the third day," is the ancient law of First-fruits in the sacred calendar of Lev. 23, 9-14. The requirement which determines Pentecost, and as a consequence the whole calendar, is that of Lev. 23, 15:

Ye shall count unto you from the morrow after the sabbath (of Passover), from the day that ye brought the sheaf of the wave offering, seven complete sabbaths unto the morrow after the seventh sabbath, fifty days.²

According to the interpretation of the Sadducees,³ which may quite possibly represent the older practice, this makes First-fruits (and Pentecost) always fall on a Sunday, or Lord's day (*κυριακή ἡμέρα*). First-fruits in the year of the crucifixion

¹ "The Resurrection in Primitive Tradition and Observance," *American Journal of Theology*, XV, 3 (July, 1911).

² On this use of "the third day" (i.e., from the beginning of the feast) see John Lightfoot on Matt. 12, 1. He interprets the curious *β* reading *δευτεροπρώτῳ* of Luke 6, 1 as "first sabbath after the second day of Passover." The numbering of days in the period Passover—Pentecost must be interpreted in view of the calendar system.

³ Menahoth 65 *a*, *b*.

(which took place on a Friday) was "on the third day," if the Friday in question was (as all the Asiatic churches insistently maintained) the 14th of Nisan, the full-moon marked by the killing of the Passover lamb. It was invariably the 16th Nisan; in the year of the crucifixion it fell on a Sunday. To Paul, therefore, as to the ancient Church generally (with the single exception of Mark), the resurrection when Christ "became the 'first-fruits' of them that slept" was "on the third day." Even Mark presupposes exactly the same interval between Jesus' death and resurrection, though for some peculiar reason he persistently employs the phrase "after three days." To this we must return presently.

Whether the particular "Scripture" referred to by Paul as implying that God had burst the Lord's prison house "on the third day" be, as we have surmised, Lev. 23, 9-14, or some other,¹ it is perfectly clear that the ancient "quartodeciman" practice of the Oriental churches, which continued in a Christian significance the ancient Jewish feast of Redemption, celebrated annually on the 14th of the first month of the year (vernal equinox according to empirical calculation), has convincing support in the earliest and most authentic documents of the New Testament. Probably this celebration of "the Lord's Passover," and of "the third day," was accompanied, at least in the regions nearer to the Palestinian home-land, by a corresponding emphasis on "the fiftieth day," Pentecost (Acts 2, 1 ff.; 20, 16). At all events, the "quartodeciman" observance of the annual Easter feast, characteristic in various forms and modifications of the Eastern churches where Jewish practices were still strong, has convincing attestation both in the New Testament and the Apostolic Fathers.

Against this stands the practice of Rome, traceable (thanks to the later peacemaking intervention of Irenaeus on behalf of his Asiatic friends) back to the time when Polycarp at Rome had resisted the friendly effort of Anicetus to induce him to swerve from the method of observance which he had received "from the Apostles."² Anicetus and the Romans were ac-

¹ Hos. 6, 2 is not employed by the early writers in this application.

² The *Vita Polycarpi* credibly relates that Polycarp had been brought to

customed (we know not on what authority nor from how far back) to subordinate the annual commemoration to the weekly as respects breaking of the fast. They doubtless regarded the keeping the feast of Nisan 14 as a Judaizing practice (as we know to have been the case at a later time), insisting that "the mystery of the Lord's death" must be observed on no other than the first day of the week; whereas quartodeciman practice of course made observance on other days, including even fast-days, unavoidable. They had no objection, however, to heightening and emphasizing the normal significance of that particular "Lord's day" which happened to fall next after the vernal equinox,¹ a form of compromise which was ultimately adopted and forms the present determination of Good Friday and Easter Sunday. Dislike of Jewish practices, and especially of any coincidence in celebration of a church feast with the festival of the "murderers of the Lord," was a prominent, if not a dominant, factor in Western rejection of the Eastern calendar. In Irenaeus' time, it threatened to disrupt Christendom because of the intolerant threat of Victor of Rome to disfellowship the Asiatic churches which should persist in their refusal to conform.

Both sides of course insisted that their opponents "made the Gospels disagree," and had methods of their own for bringing them into alleged harmony. As a matter of fact, modern study shows them hopelessly in conflict. The fourth (or Ephesian) Gospel is (as we should expect) quartodeciman. The parting supper of Jesus with the Twelve in John 13, 1-30 is not "the Passover"; this feast has still to be prepared for the succeeding night (John 13, 29; 18, 28). The Friday of the crucifixion is the "Preparation," not of the regular weekly sabbath only, but of Passover Sabbath; for, as the evangelist remarks, "the day of that sabbath was a high day" (18, 31). Hence Jesus'

Smyrna in his early youth as a slave from "the East" (i.e., Syria). Since his birth was ca. 79, he may well have had contact with "the elders" in Jerusalem, including "the Elder John" whom Irenaeus confuses with the Apostle.

¹ In Tertullian's time "Easter" was celebrated at Rome, as in Cappadocia, annually on March 25th. At Alexandria it had been celebrated on April 7th, but this was changed to the Sunday after the first full moon after the vernal equinox, and this method subsequently became general in Palestine, Egypt, and throughout the West, while Mesopotamia, Syria, and Asia Minor clung to the Ephesian observance.

death coincides to the hour with the killing of the passover lamb, just as his anointing in Bethany is made by a change of date from Mark 14, 1 to coincide with the date¹ fixed in the Law (Exod. 12, 3-6) for the consecration of the victim (John 12, 1). Christ thus appears, in Paul's language, "our passover that is sacrificed for us." He suffers on the 14th, the Preparation (Friday), the eve of the great day of the feast (first of Unleavened Bread), and "on the third day," Sunday, "the day after the sabbath," the "high sabbath" of Passover, the 16th of Nisan, or "First-fruits," he comes forth from the grave.²

This dating of the fourth Gospel is not only in harmony with First Corinthians and the ancient practice attested by Polycarp, it is also required by the underlying data of Mark itself and its two later satellites. Fundamentally the Synoptic story of the Passion required the same dating as the Johannine. The haste of the authorities to put Jesus out of the way before the gathering of the multitude "at the feast" is intended to avoid the tumult which might occur from a crowd likely to attempt the rescue of a popular prisoner. The seizure was not so flagrantly mismanaged as to take place on the very night of the great national festival. It was effected "before the Passover." Jesus was safely (and secretly) conveyed into the hands of Pilate before the multitude from Galilee had time to act. The supper of Mark 14, 17-26, which has none save the usual elements of the daily meal, leavened bread (*ἄpros*) and wine, not the unleavened cakes (*μαῖσσοth*), the sauce (*ἡαροseth*), and the roasted flesh of the Passover, corresponds to that preparatory to sacred days, sabbaths and feast-days alike, when the head of the household distributed bread and wine with a brief ritual of blessing and thanksgiving known as the Kiddush, which precedes the evening meal. Mark's description of this parting meal, has in short, nothing save the "hymn" (verse 26) to

¹ Epiphanius (Haer. i. 3) makes the motive unmistakable: "We take the sheep from the tenth day, recognizing the name of Jesus on account of the iota." The name Ἰησοῦς begin with the letter whose numerical value was 10.

² On the whole question of early Christian observance of the "Feast of Weeks" with reference to the calculation of the day of resurrection and Lordship (*κυριακή ἡμέρα*) see my article, "The Resurrection in Primitive Tradition and Observance," in *American Journal of Theology*, XV, 3 (July, 1911).

make it really correspond to the elaborate ritual of Passover, with its series of prescribed cups, and its prohibition of egress from the house until the morning. The hymn itself needs no identification with the Great Hallel to account for its citation. Christian assemblies too had their "hymns" for such occasions, which would surely appear in a description designed, like Mark's, to account for and justify prevailing usage. Even the datings beginning the paragraph on the preparation (Mark 14, 12) are so sadly confused that the preparation (which included purging the house of leaven, a ceremony of the day preceding Passover night) appears to take place "on the first day of unleavened bread." In short the circumstances and events narrated imply, even in Mark, that the last supper was not the Passover, but the meal marked by the ceremony of Kiddush which normally fell on the night before. The evangelist, who introduces the inconsistent datings of 14, 1 and 12 and the paragraph on "making ready the Passover" in the upper room (14, 12-16), is responsible for identifying the meal with the Passover; and his motive becomes apparent in the turn given to the Q logion of Luke 22, 28-30 = Matt. 19, 28. The logion has reference to a "covenanted" (*διαθήκη*) tryst at the heavenly banquet-table, a redemption feast which Jesus promises to share "in the kingdom of God" with those who have shared his "trials" here. Instead of this, Mark 14, 25 brings into special prominence the idea that the Jewish feast has no more occasion for observance, seeing it is from this time on "fulfilled in the kingdom of God."

It should not be necessary here to repeat the well known indications that the datings of the Passion story in Mark are altered from the original, and that this original would require the same "quartodeciman" datings as those of the fourth Gospel. Neither should it be necessary to repeat the reminders given in "Beginnings of Gospel Story" that we have no other explanation of the systematic marking of each quarter (or "watch") of day and night for the story of Mark 14-16 than ritual observance for the two periods of commemoration in the early Church, "the night in which (Jesus) was betrayed," marked by a vigil corresponding to the vigil of Passover, with

the following day of fast (Good Friday), and the Easter morning. In Mark 14, 17, 72; 15, 1, 33, 42; 16, 2 the periods which by the Roman Hermas are termed "stations" ¹ are marked off with the regularity and explicitness of a rubric. The evangelist could hardly say in plainer language to his reader: As Peter at midnight failed to "watch" at Jesus' entreaty (14, 37-41), so yield not thou to the weakness of the flesh, but watch and pray. As Peter at cock-crowing denied his Lord, deny thou not; remember his trial at dawn before Pilate, his crucifixion at "the third hour," his parting cry "at the ninth hour," his burial "when even was come." Remember also the tomb found empty "on the first day of the week when the sun was risen." The datings of Mark cover systematically and perfectly Rome's (anti-quartodeciman) observance of the sacred season of the Passion, reflecting every detail so far as we have the means of tracing it. But they do not in their present form correspond with the immemorial practice of the East, nor with the implications of Paul's Epistles, nor with the clear statements of the Ephesian Gospel. They even fail to correspond with the requirements of the narrative as we should infer them from the substance of Mark's own account.

Allusion has already been made to one special peculiarity of the phraseology, wherein Mark stands in curious contradiction even to the later Synoptists, who elsewhere follow his lead. It is the systematic employment of the phrase "after three days" for the interval between Good Friday night and Easter Sunday morning. In Matthew and Luke this is always changed to "the third day" save the single passage Matt. 27, 63 where Red.-Matt. has overlooked his usual correction. How perplexing the Markan expression was to early writers may be seen in the attempt of Syriac Didascalia to make out "three days" by counting the darkness of the crucifixion day as a night! ² Certainly when we consider the very early observance of Friday as a fast (Mark 2, 20, Didache, 8, 1) and the primeval observ-

¹ Sim. v. 1. *σταθίων*.

² Syr. Didasc. 21. A trace of the same may be seen in Ev. Petri 5, 18. For fuller discussion and references see the article above referred to in American Journal of Theology, XV, 3 (July, 1911).

ance of "the Lord's day" (Rev. 1, 10) as that of the breaking of the bonds of death, it cannot be questioned that Paul's "the third day" (1 Cor. 15, 4) represents the authentic and original phrase. How, then, account for the singularity of Mark? — All the other features of his Passion story find explanation, so far as datings are concerned, in the actual practice of Roman ritual. We cannot be sure that the expression "after three days" has a similar origin, for we cannot certainly say that the fast by which the Easter festival was always preceded, varying from forty hours to forty days in its present ultimate form, was a fast of "three days" in the Roman church at the time when this evangelist wrote. We do know, however, that the vernal celebration of the fast and feast of resurrection were early prevalent at Rome, where the official establishment of the festival of the Megalesia in 204 B.C. was followed by introduction of the rites of the Phrygian Attis on March 15, 22, 24, 25, and 26. In this ritual the period of mourning, fasting, and vigil between the death of the divinity culminated in the three days, March 24 ("Sanguen"), 25 ("Hilaria"), and 26.¹ The resurrection festival of his greatest rival at Rome, Osiris, was of a like period. Early Christian observance of the paschal fast varied (as we are explicitly informed) in regard to its duration. As the story itself shows that in Mark the period really meant is the same (approximately) forty-hour period contemplated by all the evangelists, what needs to be explained is only the anomaly of an inexact expression. It is at least conceivable that the expression takes its rise from a ritual practice affected (like so many others) by the custom of pre-Christian times, the custom of a three-days' observance at vernal equinox.

The evidence for a Roman provenance for Mark derivable from indications of Roman (or Western) ritual observance forms a chapter by itself in which Mark's peculiar *façon de parler* in speaking of the interval between the crucifixion and resurrection of Jesus is only one detail. As regards this the

¹ Men, originally a lunar divinity, is later combined by theocrasy with Attis, a vegetation deity. We may perhaps conjecture that the days of mourning originally coincided with the period at (astronomic) new moon when the luminary is invisible for (approximately) three days.

explanation here offered is only one of several possibilities which, so far as it goes, points to Rome as the most probable place of origin. What is really required for valid decision is a detailed and exact comparison between all the peculiarities of the Markan account of the Passion and resurrection, especially those which have reference to the fixing of days and hours, with the known peculiarities of early Roman observance.

IV. CONCLUSION

OUR affirmative answer to the question, Is Mark a Roman Gospel? leaves it almost needless to put the further query, If it is, what of it? The process by which we have sought to confirm on scientific grounds this ancient belief of the Church opens up vistas of light across the dark and baffling period where the narrative of Acts ceases, the critical historian loses the guidance of the great Pauline Epistles, and we are obliged to find the path for ourselves between the apostolic and the post-apostolic age. Certainly the pre-eminent phenomenon of the period for infant Christianity is the transition of the Church from the type of faith and order represented in the Pauline Epistles to that of the Synoptic Writings. The former is a Pauline development displaying scarcely a traceable influence from the ministry of Jesus in precept or mighty work. Of these the record might almost as well be non-existent so far as the faith and order attested by the Pauline Epistles is concerned. In the generation following, contrariwise, almost everything in the faith and order of the churches is based upon Petrine story.

Of the three great centres of influence during this period, Jerusalem, Ephesus, and Rome, that of Jerusalem is at first supreme. The martyrdom of James the son of Zebedee in 44 A.D., of his namesake the Lord's brother, head of the caliphate at Jerusalem, and the martyrdom of John the other son of Zebedee, which we may probably date coincidently with that of the other "pillar," James, in 62 A.D.,¹ could only strengthen this influence as a "red" martyrdom as well as "white." The destruction of the temple, and (in large part) of the city also, did not prevent the reassembling of the scattered church and its reorganization under leadership of other members of the family of Jesus, to suffer new persecution from the suspicious Domitian. When our third evangelist writes, and even down to the time of Papias and Hegesippus, Jerusalem is still revered as the seat of apostolic tradition, the bulwark of historic ortho-

¹ On this disputed point see E. Schwartz, *Tod der Söhne Zebedaei* (1904), Berlin, and Bacon, the chapter "The Martyr Apostles" in *Fourth Gospel in Research and Debate* (1910).

doxy against Gnostic error, a "pure virgin" untainted by any heresy. The mother church is nevertheless in relative decline. The process was inevitable with the larger growth of Gentile Christianity and the natural disappearance of the eyewitnesses. It was greatly accelerated (unless our interpretation of the data be at fault) by the inherited conservatism of the church of the Apostles and Elders, which led it to rely too exclusively for its boasted tradition of the Lord's words and deeds on unwritten tradition.

The period ended by the second great Jewish revolt, suppressed, after bloody massacres in Mesopotamia as well as in North Africa and Cyprus, by Trajan in the last year of his reign, was a period marked in the Jerusalem church by development of evangelic tradition along the midrashic-apocalyptic lines indicated by the fragments preserved by Irenaeus from Papias' "traditions of the Elders," principally in the fifth Book of his Heresies. The same period witnessed (as Eusebius informs us) the growth among the Greek-speaking churches of a large number of written Gospels, including heretical works as well as orthodox. This period of Trajan seems to have been that of Papias' enquiries, which at the time of composition of his Exegesis was already long past (*ποτέ, καλῶς ἐμνημόνευσα*). Seventeen years later (134-135) the third and most disastrous Jewish uprising under lead of Bar Cocheba brought about the irreparable dispersal of the Church of the Apostles and Elders in Jerusalem. Those who had survived the double pressure of Jewish and Roman hatred were driven into exile by Hadrian's decree forbidding approach within twelve miles of Jerusalem to any circumcised man. Henceforth the succession at Jerusalem (Aelia Capitolina as it was now renamed) is Gentile in both name and fact. Efforts like those of Hegesippus to restore its claim to be the arbiter of orthodoxy are foredoomed to failure.

Obscurity almost as great as that surrounding the history of the Christian caliphate in Jerusalem surrounds the great Pauline centre in Proconsular Asia. Ephesus was even from Paul's own time (Acts 19, 10) the predestined centre of Christianity in the Hellenic world. By 93 A.D. it is chief among seven representative "churches of Asia," which cover all Ionia and make

its sphere of influence contiguous with those which are joined with it less than a decade earlier by that Pauline encyclical to Asia Minor, the writing known to us as First Peter. From the Pastoral Epistles, the Johannine Epistles and Fourth Gospel, and from the Ignatian Epistles and the Epistle of Polycarp, we learn something of the desperate struggle of Ephesus against the foe within, Paul's "many adversaries," the men who, according to the prediction of Acts 20, 30 "shall arise from among your own selves, speaking perverse things to draw away the disciples after them."

The "epistles of the Spirit to the churches" of Rev. 1-3 come a little later to shed light on conditions in Ephesus and its neighbor churches. The author gives closer definition and a name to these "Balaamite"¹ heretics. On the other hand, the apocalyptic visions, of Palestinian origin, demonstrably translated from the Semitic, to which these "letters" are prefixed as a prologue or introduction, should be brought into relation with the acknowledged millenarianism of Papias, known to have been based upon this book. It should be compared with what we learn through Eusebius and elsewhere of the migration from Caesarea Palestinae to Hierapolis of Philip the Evangelist with his four "prophesying" daughters. One of these four prophetesses, who seems to have married a Christian, spent the remainder of her life in Ephesus. At least two of the others settled in Hierapolis, where their "traditions" became (directly or indirectly) accessible to Papias, and are reported by him.

In view of these actual connections with Palestine and of the acknowledged danger from Gnostic heresy, it is not surprising to find in Ephesus another force at work besides the magnificent reincarnation of Paulinism in the "Johannine" Epistles and Fourth Gospel. The references in First Timothy (addressed to Ephesus) and the other Pastoral Epistles to the "pattern of sound words," even "the words of our Lord Jesus Christ, the doctrine which is according to godliness," confirm what we should certainly anticipate, the effort of the church leaders in

¹ Rev. 2, 14. The mention of Balaam by name is new. The comparison is Paul's (1 Cor. 10, 6-8), and is adopted in Jude (verse 11) and 2 Peter (2, 15).

"Asia" to set up authentic gospel tradition as a bulwark against the threatening vagaries of the errorists, who are accused by Polycarp of "denying the (physical) resurrection and judgment, and perverting the sacred oracles of the Lord (τὰ λόγια τοῦ Κυρίου) to their own lusts." No wonder his later colleague (ἑταῖρος) Papias makes these two lines of teaching his main interest, (a) the doctrine of "resurrection and judgment" set forth in the "Johannine" book of prophecy, and (b) the "commandments delivered by the Lord to the faith," which Papias believed to have been recorded "in the Hebrew tongue by Matthew." It was the purpose of his book to give to these logia that authentic interpretation (as against the misinterpretation of the teachers of "alien," ἀλλοτρίας, commandments). For in Papias' "well-remembered" youth such authentic interpretation was still to be had from the "living and abiding voice" of Palestinian tradition. No wonder, then, that in enumerating the apostolic sources of these "traditions of the elders" Papias should name last "John" (the author of the "prophecy") and "Matthew" the author of the "Compilation (σύνταξις) of the Lord's Oracles." The one was his supreme authority for the doctrine of "resurrection and judgment," the other for the "oracles of the Lord."

At Ephesus, accordingly, we see distinctly two allied, but strangely diverse types of Christian teaching; the one unmistakably Pauline, the other quite as markedly Palestinian, being as largely Aramaic in language as it is characteristically Jewish in type of thought. The Ephesian canon combines the two factors under the common name of "John," the name first attached by an Ephesian editor to the Book of Revelation. Soon all five writings are ascribed to this Apostle, the Gospel, the three Epistles, and the book of "Prophecy" alike. It remained for a Dionysius, the pupil of Origen, to point out the impossibility of common authorship.

Scarcely less obscure than at Ephesus is the history of post-apostolic Christianity at Rome. Here too, however, the same great forces were at work, though in different proportion. Rome had not the experience enjoyed at Ephesus of a long period of the direct teaching of Paul. The foundations had here been

laid by other hands. Paul could only temper and guide the conflicting tendencies (Phil. 1, 15-18; 3, 1-16). On the other hand the practical disposition of the West gave less opportunity to the Gnostic vagaries so much at home in Ionia. A Pauline Logos doctrine would ultimately make its way to Rome (in spite of conservative opposition from Gaius and the *alogi*), just as the Gnostic heresies made their way thither from Antioch and Alexandria. But the process would be relatively slow. In the period of Clement (96 A.D.) and Hermas (110-130?) Rome is not so much troubled by heresy as by questions of practical administration. Justin (152-160) is her first great *malleus haereticorum*.

The dark period of Roman church history is that which follows the martyrdom of Paul under Nero (60-64). Later tradition brings Peter also thither from Antioch to suffer martyrdom "at the same time." But at least the location of this martyrdom is more than doubtful. Clement's uniting of the two great Apostles as the leaders of a common host of martyrs¹ has no real suggestion of identity of place; and subsequent Roman tradition is too obviously biased, and too open to the suspicion of suggestion from 1 Peter 5, 13 and John 21, 18-19 to inspire any confidence. Even if Peter came late in life a condemned prisoner to suffer at Rome, as is perhaps implied in the (Roman?) appendix to the fourth Gospel, he exerted no direct personal influence on the doctrinal development of the local church.

On the other hand if the traditional Roman provenance of Mark be really established along the lines followed in the foregoing discussion — if we may regard as probable the relations for which reasons have been above adduced on the one side (a) between the Gospel and the type of "strong" Paulinism reflected in Romans; on the other (b) between the tradition connecting it with "Peter" and the (doctrinally) Pauline encyclical addressed (from Rome?) to the churches of Asia Minor, urging them in the name of "Peter" to stand fast through all the (Domitianic) persecution in the "true grace of God" which they have received from Paul and Silvanus —

¹ 1 Clem. 6.

then very much in this perplexing history becomes most instructively clear.

We learn to know the supreme effort of Paul's closing years as that of the peace-maker. We see him, while preparing for the great adventure at Jerusalem which he hopes may bring together after years of hostility "the apostleship of the circumcision" given to Peter and "the apostleship of the Gentiles" given to himself, imploring the prayers and the co-operation of the "strong" at Rome. When, two years after, a prisoner practically under sentence of death in consequence of his effort at Jerusalem, he finds himself actually at Rome in company with "Mark" and other of his old-time helpers, his voice is still for peace.

Ephesians is the very embodiment of this "catholic" Paulinism. If this great Epistle of the Unity of the Spirit written from Rome under the name of Paul be not actually the product of his own pen, it is the best exposition of the later peace-making Paulinism that was ever composed. On it is based the Asian encyclical written under the name of Peter to plead for worldwide steadfastness against imperial persecution in the purity of a common faith. Here we find commendation of Mark, the companion, first of the Apostle of the circumcision, afterwards of Paul, as Peter's spiritual "son."

From Hebrews, an earlier exhortation of Deutero-Pauline and Alexandrian type probably sent to Rome, and from First Peter, we may infer what new dangers were tending in the West to effect that drawing together of Jewish and Gentile believers in behalf of which Paul's life-blood had been poured out, an "offering of reconciliation" between man and man in worthy imitation of his Master's atonement between man and God. The pressure of imperial persecution under Domitian, first severely felt (it would seem) in Palestine, but soon extended "throughout the world" (1 Peter 5, 9), produced an effect similar to that later produced in proconsular Asia by the peril of Gnostic heresy. The Christians drew together. The Pauline churches sought closer fellowship with the Petrine, and the Petrine with the Pauline. Not mere geographical divisions were overcome, but divergent tendencies co-operated. At Rome

leaders of Pauline stamp and training not only made use of the names of Mark and Peter to encourage churches of Pauline origin, but attached the same names to the surviving records of the sayings and doings of Jesus, which with the appalling mortality in the ranks of the authoritative witnesses experienced under Nero¹ had attained, as it were at a bound, to irreplaceable value.

What tendencies were in control at Rome during this obscure period of the beginnings of catholicity will be judged differently as students interpret the peculiarities of "Markan" evangelic tradition, the western branch of that which by combination with the Second Source obtained pre-eminent currency in East as well as West. The interpretation to which some expression has been given in the foregoing enquiry rests upon a comparison between Mark and the Pauline Epistles, more especially Romans. It differs widely indeed from the famous theory of Baur, though its starting point is the same, the great division attested by Paul (Gal. 2, 1-10) of the missionary field into a Petrine apostolate of the circumcision and a Pauline apostolate of the Gentiles. The reconciliation in catholicity which the Tübingen critics placed in the age of Justin and Irenaeus, we find already attempted (and to a heroic degree accomplished) by Paul. But we distinguish, as Paul himself distinguished, between such as called themselves "of Paul," mainly in the sense of insisting on their liberty, regardless of Petrine "weak brethren," and true imitators of the great Apostle, imbued with his peace-making spirit as well as appreciative of his deeper, more mystical doctrine.

To Baur, Mark was a compromising, Petro-Pauline gospel, a late combination of Matthew and Luke. Few doctrines of criticism have been more completely overturned than this. The restoration of this simple and primitive composition to its true place of precedence over Matthew and Luke is the great

¹ Heb. 10, 32; 13, 7; Rev. 17, 6; Clement ad Cor. 5. The martyrdoms of Paul and Peter (both?) at Rome, of James, (John?), and "others" (Josephus and Hegesippus ap. Eusebius, H. E. ii, 23) in Jerusalem at about the same date, would alone suffice to mark the reign of Nero with an evil pre-eminence. To Clement of Alexandria it marks, as we have seen (p. 5, note 2), the end of the apostolic age.

contribution of our age to the problem of Gospel origins. If the establishment of its post-apostolic date and Roman provenance shall help to exhibit it in what seems to the present writer its true light, a product of that "strong" Paulinism, which at Rome was later brought, through the providence of God and the prevailing spirit of Paul the peacemaker, into sympathy and loyal union with the "weak," the chief purpose of the present enquiry will have been attained.

ADDENDA ET CORRIGENDA

Page 14. To note 2 add: Lightfoot (*Ignatius*, vol. ii, p. 493) had previously expressed the conviction that Papias rested his belief on this passage.

Page 16. To note 1 add: Also κυριακὰ λόγια i. 8, 1.

Page 29, line 27. For "we have seen" read "Zahn believes."

Page 34, line 8. Add this footnote:

To the above exception should be made of 1 Clem. 15, 2, where the Roman author, ca. 95 A.D., quotes Is. 29, 13 exactly as it is given in Mark (Matthew here conforming slightly to LXX), except that he writes ἄπεισιν, where both gospels have ἀπέχει with LXX. Sanday (*The Gospels in the Second Century*, p. 69) approves the verdict of Volkmar that Clement is here affected by Mark. He even considers this passage "the strongest evidence we possess for the use of the Synoptic Gospels by Clement."

Page 43, line 18. For κολουβοδάκτυλος read κολοβοδάκτυλος.

Page 54, line 15. For λεπτό δυνά read λεπτά δύο.

Page 58, lines 4 and 7. For "faulty" and "errors" read "dialectic" and "peculiarities." The imputation of error in transliteration is unwarranted, the obscuration of the vowel (â to ô) being probably only a dialectic peculiarity. On the other hand the disagreement of the explanation: Jesus was quoting Ps. 22, 1, with the phrase: He is calling Elias (*Eliâhu*), is apparent even if with some texts the Hebrew (*Eli*) be substituted for the Aramaic (*Eliâhi*).

Page 87, line 20. Transpose ² to line 33, after "Son of God."

Page 93, line 11. For "verna" read "vernal."

PB 3957-3
708-33T

8

BS2585 .B26
Bacon, Benjamin Wisner, 1860-1932.
Is Mark a Roman gospel? /

16824

BS
2585
B26

Bacon, Benjamin Wisner, 1860-1932.

... Is Mark a Roman gospel? By Benjamin W. Bacon ...
Cambridge, Harvard university press; [etc., etc.] 1919.

3 p. l., 106 p., 1 l. 23½ cm. (Harvard theological
studies , 7)

Series title also at head of t-p.

1. Bible. N. T. Mark—Criticism, interpretation, etc. I. Title.
II. Series.

BS2585.B3

Library of Congress

[59f½]

CCSC/sk

20—188

16824

